Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/papersofamerican0000unse_f4i1

REPORT AND PAPERS

OF THE SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, DEC. 27 AND 28, 1893

PAPERS

OF THE

AMERICAN

SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

VOLUME VI.

REPORT AND PAPERS OF THE ANNUAL MEETING, HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, DEC. 27 AND 28, 1893.

EDITED BY

REV. SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, M.A.

SECRETARY

15713

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Semin
BR
140.5
A53
1894
V.6
42.34

NEW YORK & LONDON
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
The Knickerbocker Press
1894

Copyright, 1894
by
SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON

The Knickerbocker Press
(G. P. Putnam's Sons)
New York

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIETY vii

SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING xiii

THE SCHAFF MEMORIAL MEETING, Wednesday, December 27, 1893.

DR. SCHAFF AS A BIBLE STUDENT AND REVISER. By Rev. TALBOT WILSON CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D., of the Reformed (Dutch) Church 3–6

DR. SCHAFF AS UNITING TEUTONIC AND ANGLO-SAXON SCHOLARSHIP. By Bishop JOHN FLETCHER HURST, D.D., LL.D., Of the Methodist Episcopal Church 7–12

DR. SCHAFF AND THE LUTHERAN CHURCH. By Rev. HENRY EYSTER JACOBS, D.D., LLD. 13–19

DR. SCHAFF AND THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH. By Rev. C. C. TIFFANY, D.D. 20–25

DR. SCHAFF AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH. By Rev. THOMAS JOSEPH SHAHAN, D.D. 26–28

DR. SCHAFF AS A LITERARY WORKER. By E. C. RICHARDSON, Ph.D., Librarian of the College of New Jersey . . . 29–31

TRIBUTE FROM REV. JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN, D.D., of the Unitarian Church 32–33

LIFE AND WORK OF BISHOP FRANCIS ASBURY. By Rev. ASBURY LOWREY, D.D. 37–62

BENJAMIN SCHMOLCK, Author of "My Jesus as Thou Wilt!" A Monograph. By Rev. JEREMIAH EAMES RANKIN, D.D., LL.D., President of Howard University, Washington, D.C. . 65–78

THE LIFE AND WORK OF S. THOMAS AQUINAS. By Rev. THOMAS O'Gorman, D.D., Professor of Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 81–97

PAGE

THE GOSPEL OF PETER. By Rev. ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City 101–130

FAUST AND THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS. By ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON, Ph.D., Librarian of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J. 133–145

THE CONTEST FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN MASSACHUSETTS. By Rev. HENRY S. BURRAGE, D.D., Editor of *Zion's Advocate*, Portland, Me. 149–168

THE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By HENRY C. VEDDER, New York City . . . 171–192

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD. By Rev. GILBERT FEARING WILLIAMS, Washington, D.C. 195–212

LIST OF MEMBERS, HONORARY AND ACTIVE 213

INDEX 221

CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

[Adopted at the organization, Friday, March 23, 1888.]

I.

This Society shall be called

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

II.

Its object shall be the promotion of studies in the department of Church History.

III.

The officers shall be a President, four Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, and a Treasurer.

These officers and four other members shall constitute the Council, of which five shall be the quorum.

IV.

The duties of the persons just named shall be respectively as follows:

The President, or in his absence a Vice-President, shall preside at all the meetings of the Society. In the absence of these officers, the Society may choose a temporary president from the members present.

The Secretary shall notify the members at least two weeks in advance of each meeting, keep the minutes, and conduct the correspondence of the Society under the direction of the Council.

The Treasurer shall send bills regularly to all annual members, take charge of the funds of the Society, and invest and disburse them under the direction of the Council.

The Council shall be charged with the general interests of the Society, including the election of members, the calling of meetings, the selection of papers, and the determination of what papers shall be published, and the auditing of the Treasurer's accounts.

V.

The Council and all the other officers shall be elected at the annual meeting. But the Council may fill vacancies until the next annual meeting.

VI.

Any person approved by the Council may become a member of the Society upon the payment of an initiation fee of $5.00, and continue a member by paying after the first year an annual fee of $3.00. On payment of fifty dollars at any one time any member may become a life-member exempt from fees.

VII.

One copy of each of the publications of the Society, issued after their election, shall be sent to all honorary and life-members, to all annual members not in arrears for more than two years, and to all libraries subscribing $3.00 annually.

VIII.

Persons not residing in America may be elected honorary members.

IX.

The Society shall meet annually at such time and place as the Council may determine. Special meetings may be called at the discretion of the Council. Ten members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may sit for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

X.

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any annual meeting, provided that notice of such amendment shall be given at the preceding annual meeting, or the amendment itself shall be approved by the Council before the meeting at which it shall be voted upon.

THE SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

THE SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY.

The Society met in the lecture-room of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church, Fifth Avenue and Forty-eighth Street, New York City, on Wednesday and Thursday, December 27 and 28, 1893. The sessions were presided over by the Second Vice-President, Bishop J. F. Hurst.

The first session was held on Wednesday at 8.15 P.M. Bishop Hurst, on taking the chair, alluded to the death of the President of this Society, the Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., on October 20th, and called upon our associate, the pastor of the church, the Rev. Dr. E. B. Coe, to offer prayer. He then announced that in accordance with the action of the Council the session would be devoted to the consideration of the life and services of the late founder of the Society, the Rev. Dr. Schaff.

The Secretary read letters of regret for non-attendance from the Revs. Doctors Baird, Fisher, Hamlin, Roberts, Shahan, Mead, Appel, Dubbs, Wolf, and Scott, and then the regular program was taken up and the following papers were presented:

Dr. Schaff as a Bible Student and Reviser, by Rev. Dr. T. W. Chambers.

Dr. Schaff as Uniting Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon Scholarship, by Bishop Hurst.

Dr. Schaff and the Lutheran Church, by Rev. Prof. Dr. H. E. Jacobs.

Dr. Schaff and the Episcopal Church, by Rev. Dr. C. C. Tiffany.

Dr. Schaff as a Literary Worker, by Dr. E. C. Richardson. *Dr. Schaff and the Roman Catholic Church*, by Rev. Prof. Dr. T. J. Shahan, and a personal tribute to Dr. Schaff from Rev. Dr. J. H. Allen, of the Unitarian Church, were read by the Secretary.

The Secretary then presented the following minute, which was adopted unanimously by a rising vote:

"The American Society of Church History, assembled in its sixth annual meeting, marks with sorrow the absence of the familiar form of its Founder and President, the Rev. Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., who on the twentieth day of October of this year entered upon the higher life.

"It takes this occasion to express its thanks to Almighty God for the long term of earthly labor He granted His servant, for the many duties He strengthened Him to perform, and for the distinguished success with which He crowned his efforts.

"It looks back upon his career as its record is now made up and wonders at its providential course. The boy in the town of Coire, in Switzerland, becomes the eager student in the gymnasium at Stuttgart, in Würtemberg, and then passes with redoubled ardor to the Universities of Tübingen, Halle, and Berlin, where he studies theology in all its branches under the stimulus successively of those three men, so diverse in faith but so equal in talent—Baur, Müller, and Neander. At twenty-one he attains the grade of licentiate in theology, and receives permission to lecture in the theological faculty of Berlin. He dreams of a life as theological professor in the Fatherland. Yet in three years thereafter he finds himself in the New World, and from that time on he is so identified with the United States, and rises to such eminence among us, that his appointment to preside over the American committee to revise the English version of the Scriptures is hailed as eminently proper, he not being considered a foreigner but as one of ourselves.

"This Society being especially interested in the promotion of the study of church history records its judgment upon him when it declares that while the people at large probably

knew him best as a Bible expositor, it is as church historian that his fame is most likely to be permanent. He possessed to an unusual degree the qualifications for historical work—a love of truth which was a passion; a broadmindedness which raised him above prejudice and sectarian differences; a judiciousness which kept him at equipoise in the midst of controversies till his mind was made up; a courtesy which made him treat kindly adverse critics and ignorant judges; a humility which gave him grace to retract opinions subsequently found to be erroneous; and what was best of all, a thoroughly Christian spirit which impelled him to sympathize with all that was worthy in the past and in the present, no matter what name it bore. These are the necessary qualities of him who would present truly the history of the Church. And he had them all, and, besides, an extraordinary memory, unswerving devotion, and untiring energy. The result lies before us in those well-known and highly prized volumes which tell the story of Christianity from its humble beginnings in Galilee to its triumphs in Geneva, which bring together its creeds and its canons, and which make us acquainted with its varied, interesting, and divinely moulded life.

"This Society was founded by him. He hoped that it would continue to exist for the promotion of studies in church history. The name he gave it is striking evidence of his own catholicity. It is not the Society of American Church History, but the American Society of Church History, for he desired it to search for truth in all lands and times. But this Society was not founded by him and then left to go its way alone. He gave it constant attention. His last thoughts in health were about it and his latest plans were for the formation of a fund to enable it to undertake unremunerative but desirable scientific labors. In the series of denominational histories now being published under its auspices he took the greatest interest and was solicitous to have it not only worthy of the Society's standing, but promotive of a more brotherly feeling among the different communions.

"The Society cannot close its tribute, so unworthy of its subject, without alluding to its founder as a man. He was respected and trusted; he was also beloved. His bright smile, his cordial greeting, his hearty laugh, his keen interest in all things about him, his comradeship with persons in all lines of occupation; the readiness with which he formed acquaintances, and the tenacity with which he held them—these are traits remembered and emphasized. He was a lover of his kind and a friend of man. In every assembly he attracted attention, and drew people toward him. And yet how modest, almost shy he was! One of the most distinguished men of our time, he bore himself quietly, unostentatiously, and simply. He hedged himself round with no pomp or circumstance. He was always dignified, and no one would have thought of being familiar with him, yet he never repelled any one, rather he had a welcome for every one. It was his noble qualities which gave him his hosts of friends.

"But his earthly career has ended. God's hand has written 'finis' on the volume of his life. The last word of the last book he wrote is 'Christ,' and this was doubtless his first word as the glories of the eternal world burst upon him, and he regained the power of speech of which his final illness had deprived him many anxious hours before he died. The highest tribute which this Society can pay to the memory of its founder is to declare that he was faithful to the motto of his Church History: *Christianus sum; Christiani nihil a me alienum puto* (I am a Christian; nothing which concerns Christ is indifferent to me)."

The benediction was then pronounced by the Rev. Dr. Chambers.

The second session was held on Thursday at 10 A.M. The first business was the reading by the Secretary of his sixth annual report, which was as follows:

During the year ten members have been received and eight have resigned. Three members have died, and to them we now pay our tribute. The first in order of time was ELLIOTT FITCH SHEPARD, who died in New York

City, March 24, 1893, in consequence of the inhalation of ether, preparatory to an operation. He was one of the original life members of this Society, and gave it a noteworthy reception when the Society met in New York in 1889. He was born in Jamestown, Chautauqua County, N. Y., July 25, 1833, so that he was not quite sixty when so unexpectedly summoned from this life. He studied law in the office of the Hon. Edwards Pierrepont, and was admitted to the bar in 1858. During the civil war he was instrumental in sending to the field nearly 50,000 troops, and raised the 51st N. Y. Regiment, which in his honor was called "The Shepard Rifles." He was commonly known as Col. Shepard. In 1876 he had a prominent part in founding the New York State Bar Association. Of late years he was before the public as owner and editor of the New York *Mail and Express*, an evening paper of pronounced Republican politics, and as founder and principal supporter of the American Sabbath Union. He married in 1868 the daughter of Wm. H. Vanderbilt. The University of the City of New York gave him the degree of Master of Laws in 1892, and the University of Omaha, Nebraska, in the same year the degree of Doctor of Laws.

On May 13th, the Rev. ABEL HASTINGS ROSS, D.D., died at Port Huron, Mich., aged sixty-two years. He was born at Winchendon, Mass., April 28, 1831, and graduated from Oberlin College (1857) and at Andover Theological Seminary (1860); from 1861 to 1866 he was Congregational pastor in Boylston, Mass.; from 1866 to 1873 in Springfield, Ohio; from 1873 to 1876 in Columbus, Ohio; from 1876 till his death in Port Huron, Mich. He was considered an authority in church polity, and since 1871 he lectured alternate years upon the subject in Oberlin Theological Seminary. His chief work in this department was his lectures on the Southworth Foundation delivered in Andover Theological Seminary in 1882–86 and published under the title: *Church-Kingdom: Lectures on Congregationalism* (Boston, 1888). He was also the author of a *Pocket Manual of Congregationalism* (1889), *Sermons for Children* (1887), and numerous

pamphlets and articles. He received the degree of D.D. from Olivet College, Mich., in 1884.[1]

The third was the Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., the founder of this Society, who died in New York City, October 20, 1893. He was born in Coire (or Chur), the capital of the Swiss canton of Grisons (or Graubündten), only one third of whose inhabitants speak German—the rest mostly employ Romansch dialects. To-day Coire has nearly 9000 inhabitants, but seventy-five years ago was probably much smaller. There is much curious architecture in the place. The principal building is the Cathedral of St. Lucius, part of which dates from the eighth century. Dr. Schaff thus was born in a babel of tongues and lived in the daily presence of much that must have made a great impression upon his extraordinarily receptive mind. Perhaps it was the scenes of his childhood which turned his attention toward church history. From Coire he went to Stuttgart, whose gymnasium he attended, and then passed in regular course to the universities of Tübingen, Halle, and Berlin. In Tübingen Baur was the reigning theological king and was putting the conservatives upon their mettle. Young Schaff did not accept Baur's destructive criticism; rather was repelled by it, although much impressed by Baur's philosophical grasp of historical problems, and especially by his idea of a progressive development in history. He was also influenced by his teacher, Julius Müller, who came to Halle in 1839, and most of all by August Neander in Berlin. He was always proud to call himself a pupil of Neander's, and surely he could have had no better teacher. Neander had genius but no crotchets. His eccentricity expended itself in clothes and manners. It did not get into his books, which are eminently sober and conservative. From Neander he learned correct historical methods and perhaps caught that irenic spirit which so distinguished him. On May 29, 1841, he took the degree of licentiate of theology in Berlin, and he there, on November 16, 1842, acquired the *venia legendi*

[1] Prof. G. F. Wright, D.D., LL.D., of Oberlin, has kindly furnished information embodied above.

on his return from travelling as companion to a young nobleman through Italy, and became a privat docent, or, as we say, tutor. His *habilitationsschrift* was on the Brethren of Christ. He delivered his first trial lecture on "The Apostolic Types of Doctrine," December 3d; his second trial lecture, which was in Latin, on "The Idea and Aim of Theology," December 7th, and on December 12th, began his regular course of lectures, one on the Catholic Epistles and the other on "The History of Modern German Theology." Thus he chose very ambitious topics at the start, and topics admitting of very broad treatment. The youth of twenty-two was already a learned man and had the promise of a distinguished career. He threw himself into his new duties with enthusiasm. But Providence had quite other plans for him than those he had made for himself. The German Reformed Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pa., was in need of a man who should take what was called the German professorship, and the Synod sent the Rev. Drs. Hoffeditz and Schneck to the Fatherland to consult with persons most likely to help them make a wise choice. As the result, on one memorable day in the summer of 1843 they called upon Licentiate Schaff in his study in Berlin and informed him that the theological professors in Halle and Berlin, especially Tholuck, Julius Müller, and Neander, had unanimously directed them to him as the suitable person to fill the position named. Licentiate Schaff could not but feel greatly flattered, and signified his willingness to go to them. It was a bold and novel enterprise, in which he embarked with a stout heart. In December he received the formal call from the Synod, and the next spring (1844) he left Berlin, was ordained at Elberfeld, and then spent seven weeks in London and Oxford. For the first time he came in contact with English scholars—he could already speak some English, —and quite characteristically he made the acquaintance of the leaders of the Tractarian movement—Pusey, Newman, and Mariott, and of the Broad Church party—Stanley and Jowett, as well. He had indeed a genius for friendship, and no man in America knew more persons, at all events

theologians who were worth knowing, than he. His inaugural address on "The Principle of Protestantism as Related to the Present State of the Church" was delivered in German at Allentown, Pa., in October of that year (1844). It was a vindication of the Reformation on the theory of progressive historical development, which, as already said, he got from Baur. His colleague, Rev. Dr. Nevin, translated it into English and prefaced it with a polemical introduction. It made a sensation, and led to his trial for heresy by the Synod of York in 1845. He defended himself in a brief speech in English and was acquitted by an overwhelming majority. He was little troubled by this episode, as he was ready to return to Germany and continue his professional career there. In 1846 he was threatened with another heresy trial based upon his advocacy of the doctrines of the middle state and the salvation of all children dying in infancy and of all heathens who died in preparedness to receive the gospel if it had been offered to them. These teachings appear in his essay upon the sin against the Holy Spirit, which was published in Halle in 1841 and was his first publication. The Board of Visitors of the Seminary settled the matter satisfactorily and he was not brought to trial. In 1848 he started the first theological periodical published in America in German. It was called *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund*, and was edited by him till 1854, and then removed to Philadelphia where Dr. Mann continued it till 1860. In 1857 appeared a Liturgy for the German Reformed Church, the labor through seven years of the committee of which he was chairman. In 1859 he issued a German hymn-book for the same body, his own compilation; in 1863 a history and tercentenary edition of the Heidelberg Catechism in German, an excellent piece of work. In 1863 he removed to New York and was Secretary of the N. Y. Sabbath Committee till 1869, when he was called to Union Theological Seminary. He did a remarkable work among the Germans in defence of the American idea of Sunday, travelled extensively, and organized mass-meetings in behalf

of the cause. His speeches in German are eloquent, and it should be remarked that although he used English correctly and fluently, it was in his mother tongue that he best displayed his powers as a public speaker. In this Sabbath-defence work he showed his executive ability, which was of a high order. He was a shrewd judge of men and picked out those best able to aid him.

But the professor's chair was his proper place, and so while secretary he delivered courses of lectures on church history in the Andover, Hartford, and Union (1869–70) theological seminaries, and was no doubt very glad to enter into the permanent service of the last named institution. From 1870 to 1873 he was professor of theological cyclopædia and Christian symbolism; from 1873 to 1874, of Hebrew; from 1874 to 1887, of sacred literature; from 1887 to Tuesday, March 14, 1893, professor of church history. On the latter date he was made professor emeritus. On Friday, July 15, 1892, while summering at Lake Mohonk, Ulster Co., N. Y., at about 8.30 in the morning he had a stroke of apoplexy. He rallied in an astonishingly short time and resumed his literary work, contrary to the advice of his physician and his friends, but in obedience to an overmastering necessity. He was, however, a broken man. There was in this city no more pathetic sight than the great scholar sitting in his chair, his brain active, his mind unclouded, his memory intact, but his right hand unable to hold a pen and the shadow of impending death resting upon him. He had so much still to do which only he could do. He wanted to finish his church history —how often he said it,—he wanted to fill the gap of four centuries which he had left and to write the story of the Reformation epoch till its proper close in 1648. But he could not. Another work, already begun, claimed prior attention, and so with many interruptions and with many fears that he would have to stop altogether he labored on until he completed his volume on theological encyclopædia and saw it fairly out of the press on Tuesday, October 3, 1893. On Monday, October 9th, at 3 A.M., he was seized with angina pectoris, that dreadful malady which causes

such agony. He had had an attack some eight years before. He had another on Thursday, October 12th. But he rallied and expected to recover. This might have been if he had not been shattered in health. On Wednesday, October 18th, he had a second stroke of apoplexy, and, although conscious much of the time nearly to the last, lost entirely the power of speech and almost entirely that of motion of any kind, being only able to make a feeble though intelligent response by the pressure of his hand to the tender ministrations of his family. At 7.45 A.M. on Friday, October 20, 1893, he died.

He had lived long; nearly five and seventy years. He had done a great work. He had a wide influence. He had received many public recognitions of his ability and learning. In 1854 the University of Berlin bestowed upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity; in 1887 he received the same degree from the University of St. Andrews, and in 1892 from the University of the City of New York. In 1876 he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Amherst College. He was a member of many learned societies. In the fall of 1892 he celebrated his jubilee as a teacher of theology, and was the recipient of congratulatory addresses from the University of Berlin—in which he was compared to Jerome and Butzer,—from the Eastern Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, from the faculty, directors, and students of Union Theological Seminary, from the theological faculty of Yale College, from the University of the City of New York, and from this Society.

He bore a prominent part in many important enterprises. He was one of the founders and honorary secretaries of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance; and one of the founders of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches. But the more remarkable fact in his career was that he was the organizer and chairman of the American Bible-Revision Committee. He issued the call to the meeting held in his house on Friday, March 23, 1888, at which this Society was

founded, and of which he was president from that time on till his death.

It was expected that Professor Fisher would at this meeting present a study of Dr. Schaff's work as a church historian, and much was anticipated from such a master. Illness prevented him and we are much the losers thereby. It seems, however, proper that something should be said upon the topic in view of the fact that we are a society of persons interested in the study of church history. For any elaborate treatment there is no time; for any adequate treatment there is no ability on the part of the present writer.

Dr. Schaff was a born historian. As we contemplate his life to-day we cannot but regret that he did not more limit his literary work to the historical field. We believe that thus his history might easily have been completed according to his plan. Still, as Horace Bushnell says, "Every man's life is a plan of God's," or as the Psalmist puts it: "The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord" (Ps. 37:23), and the public gained greatly by Dr. Schaff's writings in the widely scattered fields of biblical introduction, New Testament exegesis, the English language, and American politics. He knew so much; his opinion was so valuable, his acquaintance with his contemporaries was so uncommon, that he was tempted to turn aside from the path of a church historian. He was besought to edit commentaries, Bible dictionaries, theological encyclopædias, and libraries of patristic literature. We cannot now attempt to speak of his work in these lines. We limit ourselves to his histories.

Quite prophetic was it that his first publication, the essay on the sin against the Holy Spirit, dated Berlin, December 22, 1840, written therefore in his twenty-first year, has as an appendix a sketch of the sorrowful close of the apostate Francesco Spiera's life, for this was to be true of all his later work—there would be an historical element in it. So his inaugural upon "The Principle of Protestantism," while philosophical, is much more historical and contains references to passing events. With his *History of the Apostolic*

Church, in 1853, he was fairly launched upon his career as historian. The book is now out of print, which is a pity, as it is an exceedingly valuable presentation from the sources of the founding, spread, and persecutions, moral and religious life, government, worship, doctrine, and theology, of the Apostolic Church, and in the judgment of many Dr. Schaff did not supersede it, although he gave its results in later works. In its English dress it is a translation, by Rev. Dr. E. D. Yeomans, of Dr. Schaff's expansion of the first volume of his church history, which he wrote in German and published in Mercersburg, in 1851. In 1858 he issued the first volume of his general church history in English, in the translation of Rev. Dr. Yeomans, who was a very superior translator. In it he summarized his *History of the Apostolic Church*, but carried the story down to 311, when Constantine appears on the scene. At once it was recognized that America had a man to match with British church historians ; one who had learning, fervor, picturesqueness, and iron diligence. His fairness, candor, and readability secured him at once a place in public regard. This favorable judgment was confirmed when he issued his second and third volumes (combined in one in 1866), again in the translation of the Rev. Dr. Yeomans, which go from Constantine to Gregory the Great (311–590). This ended his presentation of the Ancient Church. It was not till 1885, a period of twenty years, that he continued his history. Meanwhile, however, he revised in a thorough fashion his first three volumes, very much expanding them and expressing a different opinion on several important points. The first volume of the revised edition appeared in 1882, the second in 1883, and the third in 1884. He no longer needed a translator. In 1885 he issued his fourth volume, which goes from Gregory the Great to Gregory the Seventh (590–1073). Much to the disappointment of his readers and students, he passed over the concluding part of the mediæval age and in 1888 brought out his history of the Reformation in Germany down to the diet and confession of Augsburg (1530) ; and then leaving the Lutheran move-

ment he turned to his native Switzerland, and in 1892 told the story of Zwingli and Calvin. Thus he never finished Luther's life, but did ample justice to the Calvinistic movement, carrying the story down to Beza's death in 1605.

In the review of Dr. Schaff's last named volume in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, for November 25, 1893, Professor Kawerau passes judgment upon Dr. Schaff as an historian, and if, as has been said, the criticism of foreigners is the estimate of posterity, who are the final judges, then Kawerau, a most competent critic, will be listened to attentively. One sentence only can be quoted here: "The attractive features of Schaff's works are here found in full measure: a truly surprising acquaintance with the writings of the Germans in his topics; a mild, but unprejudiced judgment; and a candor which compels him to recognize and to bring out the defects even in his favorite characters." The Berlin theological faculty declare that his church history has taken "most honorable rank among the church histories of the day by virtue of the thoroughness of its execution and the clearness of its style. It is the most notable monument of universal historical learning produced by the school of Neander."

One great service, the greatest single service he rendered, was his three noble volumes upon *The Creeds of Christendom*, which appeared in 1876. The first one is a history of the Creeds, and the second and third are the original texts themselves, in most cases accompanied by English translations. The volumes are positively unique. The history is learned, surprisingly full, and fresh. It gives the results of wide research, and no one of Dr. Schaff's works is destined to have a longer life, as none has met with a heartier reception.

The last historical work to be mentioned is the edition of the *Didaché*, "The Oldest Church Manual," as he calls it. This came out in 1885. It is Dr. Schaff's only appearance as editor of an original text. It is exceedingly well done, and by far the most complete and judicious edition of the

remarkable find of Bryennios. No one but a first-class scholar could have written such a book.

This imperfect presentation of Dr. Schaff's activity as a church historian will close with the bare mention of his last work, *The Theological Propædeutic.* In it he goes over all the ground of theological study. It will be the guide of many a student in the queen of sciences. His last contribution is thus the most comprehensive of all.

The Society at a special meeting held in the chapel of the Church of the Covenant, just prior to the funeral of Dr. Schaff, upon Monday, October 23, 1893, at 10 P.M., passed this minute:

"Last year we paid our tribute of grateful recognition of the remarkable services Dr. Schaff had rendered to the cause of sacred learning, and especially in the department of church history, and rejoiced with him in his completion of fifty laborious and fruitful years as a professor of theology. To-day we mourn his departure. Yet we recognize the goodness of God in sparing him so long and allowing him to do so much. Leaving to another occasion the production of suitable resolutions, we now merely declare that in his death our Society has lost its founder, its first President, and its best friend; and that each of us will cherish the memory of his unfailing courtesy, his modesty, and geniality, his simple-hearted piety and deep religious feeling. He served his generation with rare ability, and when he fell asleep he heard the plaudit: 'Well done, good and faithful servant! Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'"

By vote of the Council on Nov. 2d the first session of this meeting was set apart for the consideration of Dr. Schaff's remarkable services. It was not possible to carry out the program which had been arranged, owing to providential hindrances, but the memorial papers which were presented are given in this volume.

The Secretary has received during the year pamphlets from different members. He notes with satisfaction the following publications from members of this Society: 1. The

translation by Professor Mitchell of Harnack's *Outline of the History of Doctrine*; 2. Prof. A. C. Thomas's interesting and fresh study in church history entitled *The Family of Love, or the Familists*; 3. Prof. O. J. Thatcher's noteworthy study of the Apostolic Church; 4. Rev. George Anson Jackson's religious novel, *The Son of a Prophet*; 5. Rev. Dr. Schaff's *Theological Propædeutic*; and 6. Professor Walker's painstaking and authoritative *Creeds of Congregationalism.* These are all independent publications. But besides them notice must be taken of the beginning of the important series of denominational histories to be published under the auspices of this Society through an editorial committee by the Christian Literature Company of this city. The proposition for such a series came from Dr. Schaff, but the plan of it was first discussed at the meeting in this city in 1889, and first outlined by Prof. Dr. Newman at the meeting in Washington in 1890, at which the editorial committee was formed. The list of writers as now made up is the result of much correspondence. The contributors according to the original prospectus were given from three to five years in which to prepare their volumes. But owing to exceptionally favorable circumstances and, too, to some self-sacrifice, two volumes have already appeared: Vol. i., on *The Religious Forces of the United States*, by H. K. Carroll, LL.D., on Friday, November 10, 1893, and vol. iv., *The Lutherans*, by the Rev. H. E. Jacobs, D.D., LL.D., on Monday, December 18, 1893. The series is sold by subscription only. It is satisfactory to note that the advance sale was large. There will be twelve, possibly thirteen, volumes in all.

The Treasurer then rendered his account as follows:

Barr Ferree, Treasurer, in account with The American Society of Church History:

1893.

Balance on hand	$ 33.32
Received from members for dues, etc.	698.50
Received from G. P. Putnam's Sons for merchandise sold	50.00
	$781.82

EXPENDITURES.

1892.		
Dec. 8.	Janitor, Washington meeting	$ 2.00
1893.		
Jan. 16.	Printing treasurer's receipts	2.25
March 10.	G. P. Putnam's Sons due for Vol. IV	125.00
July 7.	" " " " " " "	21.00
" 13.	G. W. McLanahan, returned, overpayment	1.00
" 22.	G. P. Putnam's Sons on account Vol. IV	200.00
" 28.	Knickerbocker Press	12.40
Aug. 11.	G. P. Putnam's Sons on account Vol. V	50.00
Sept. 8.	" " " " " " "	25.00
Oct. 21.	" " " " " " "	50.00
Dec. 2.	" " " " " " "	50.00
" 15.	" " " " " by merchandise	50.00
" 23.	Honorarium to Secretary for 1892 and 1893	50.00
" 27.	G. P. Putnam's Sons, balance due on Vol. V	135.82
	Balance on hand	7.35
		$781.82

The next item of business was the consideration of the following action of the Council at its meeting in the council room of the University of the City of New York, Tuesday afternoon, November 2, 1893:

"*Resolved*:—That it is the unanimous opinion of the Council that the Constitution should be amended in Art. VI., so as to read thus:

"Any person approved by the Council may become a member of the Society upon the payment of an initiation fee of $5.00, and continue a member by paying after the first year an annual fee of $5.00."

The Secretary had been requested to give notice, in his call for the annual meeting, that such amendment would be proposed at the coming meeting. The increase in the annual dues, from $3.00 to $5.00, was necessitated by the circumstances of the Society.

After full discussion it was on motion resolved to lay the proposed amendment upon the table till the next annual meeting, as in consequence of the general depression in business it was inexpedient at this time to increase the annual dues.

On suggestion of Dr. E. C. Richardson, the Secretary was authorized to ask the members to pay $3.00 each for their volume of the Papers of 1893, should the state of the Society's treasury make such voluntary payments desirable.

Then followed the reading of papers, according to program, as follows: "Benjamin Schmolck—a Monograph," by Rev. J. E. Rankin, D.D., LL.D., President of Howard University, Washington, D. C. The paper was discussed by Rev. Drs. Chambers and Spaeth and Rev. Mr. Nicum. "Life and Work of Rev. Francis Asbury, First Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States," by Rev. A. Lowrey, D.D., New York City. "Prayers for the Dead," by Rev. G. F. Williams, Archdeacon of Washington, D. C. The paper was discussed by Rev. Drs. Chambers and Smyth and Prof. E. C. Mitchell, with replies by Mr. Williams.

The Chairman then announced as auditor of the Treasurer's accounts, Rev. Dr. Chambers; and as committee in nomination of officers and councillors for the ensuing year and on place of next annual meeting, Rev. H. K. Carroll, LL.D., Prof. E. C. Mitchell and the Secretary. After receiving a number of nominations to membership the Society took recess.

The third and closing session was opened at 3 P.M. The following papers were read: "St. Thomas Aquinas," by Rev. Prof. Thomas O'Gorman, D.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; "The History of the Doctrine of Apostolic Succession in the Church of England," by Mr. Henry C. Vedder, New York City; "The Gospel of Peter," by Rev. Prof. A. C. McGiffert, Ph.D., D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York City. The paper was discussed by Prof. Dr. E. C. Smyth. "The Contest for Religious Liberty in Massachusetts," by Rev. H. S. Burrage, D.D., Portland, Me.; "Faust and the Clementine Recognitions," by Dr. E. C. Richardson, Princeton, N. J.

Rev. Dr. Chambers reported that he had examined the Treasurer's account with the vouchers annexed as far as the time allowed, and found the same correct, and that the

balance now in the treasury is seven dollars and thirty-five cents. On motion the report was accepted.

Prof. E. C. Mitchell read the report of his committee, in the absence of its chairman, as follows: for President, Bishop J. F. Hurst; for Vice-Presidents—Rev. Drs. H. M. Baird, G. P. Fisher, H. E. Jacob, C. C. Tiffany; for Secretary, Rev. S. M. Jackson; for Treasurer, Mr. Barr Ferree; for Councillors—Rev. Drs. T. W. Chambers, J. M. Buckley, H. M. MacCracken, and Mr. H. C. Vedder. The place of next meeting—Washington, D. C.

On motion this report was adopted unanimously.

The following persons, all clergymen, whose names had been given in at the morning session, were unanimously elected to membership in the Society: D. Berger, Dayton, O.; J. W. E. Bowen, Atlanta, Ga.; C. E. Grammer, Theological Seminary, Va.; J. A. W. Haas, New York City; T. W. Hopkins, Auburn. N. Y.; W. Hull, Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.; T. C. Johnson, Hampden Sidney, Va.; H. W. Jones, Gambier, O.; A. Mackay-Smith, Washington, D. C.; R. H. McKim, Washington, D. C.; C. H. Small, Washington, D. C.; J. D. Steele, New York City; J. H. Vincent, Topeka, Kan.

On motion the thanks of the Society were given to the pastors and consistory of the Collegiate Dutch Church for their hospitality.

After prayer by Rev. Dr. Alvah Hovey, the Society adjourned to meet during Christmas week next year in the city of Washington, D. C.

The following members of the Society were in attendance: H. M. Booth, W. A. Brown, H. K. Carroll, T. W. Chambers, E. B. Coe, J. B. Drury, J. L. Ewell, Barr Ferree, J. F. Hurst, S. M. Jackson, H. E. Jacobs, A. Lowrey, A. C. McGiffert, E. C. Mitchell, J. Nicum, T. O'Gorman, J. E. Rankin, E. C. Richardson, D. S. Schaff, J. R. Smith, Judson Smith, A. Spaeth, J. Strong, C. C. Tiffany, H. C. Vedder.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON,

Secretary.

THE SCHAFF MEMORIAL MEETING

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1893

THE SCHAFF MEMORIAL MEETING,

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1893.

DR. SCHAFF AS A BIBLE STUDENT AND REVISER.

By Rev. TALBOT WILSON CHAMBERS, D.D., LL.D.,
Of the Reformed (Dutch) Church.

I.

Although Dr. Schaff's favorite pursuit was Historical Theology, and to this his life was consecrated, yet exegesis always attracted his attention. This was one of the two subjects upon which he lectured as *privat-docent* at the beginning of his university career. And it was the theme of the chair he occupied in the Union Theological Seminary from 1875 until he was called to succeed Dr. R. D. Hitchcock in Church History. It also occupied his attention in the Scripture Commentaries, which he edited, and of which he was in part the author. Although in early life he studied both Testaments, and at one time gave instruction in Hebrew, yet in after years he devoted himself mainly to the Greek Testament, and here his profiting appeared unto all.

He was an excellent textual critic, and to his pen we owe what is the very best *résumé* of the rise and progress of Biblical criticism in his *Companion to the Greek Testament and the Revised Version.* He kept pace with the advance of the science, and his mind was always open to new evidence, from whatever quarter. He was singularly free from dogmatic prejudice, and sought to form his opinion on any

vexed question simply from weighing carefully the testimonies on either side. It would be too much to say that he was always correct, but it is certain that he always gave his best efforts to ascertain the truth. In exegesis, his familiarity with the results attained by previous inquirers was of great service, enabling him often to start where they left off, and preventing him from offering as novelties what had already been suggested and repudiated. Besides his abundant knowledge, he had the very great advantage of that indispensable prerequisite for a successful exegete—profound sympathy with the character and purpose of revelation. To him the Bible was the word of God, and he studied it, not simply as a scholar, but also as a believer. Hence he was always reverent and sober, not so much anxious to display his critical acumen as to ascertain the mind of the Spirit. Yet this did not render him insensible to the human element in the Scripture. I remember his expressing to me once, while engaged in revising the commentary on Romans in Lange's *Bibel-werk*, his profound admiration of the intellectual force of the Apostle, quite apart from the inspiration of which he was the medium or organ. It is, I think, quite unfortunate for his reputation as an exegete that his contributions to the literature of the New Testament are intermingled with the work of other men, as in the volumes of Lange on Matthew, John, and the Romans, but whoever consults the notes and expositions there given will find reason to commend Dr. Schaff's scholarship, penetration, and fairness of mind.

II.

In the matter of the recent revision of the English Bible, Dr. Schaff held a very conspicuous place. It was owing to him, in connection with Dr. Howson, Dean of Chester, on occasion of the latter's visit to this country in 1871, that the British Revision Committee took the important step of inviting American co-operation. And when that step was taken, the selection of the persons to compose the American

Committee was left to him; nor can there be a doubt that the trust was managed with sagacity and judgment. To avoid misconception, he chose in each denomination of Christians the men who had been called by their brethren to serve in the exegetical chairs of theological seminaries, so that these persons might justly be called representative men. Of course, as the work was to be done by mutual personal conference, the choice was confined to those whose residence was within a few hundred miles of New York. The expenses of the committee were met by private contributions of individuals, the procuring of which, while shared in by other members of the companies, was mainly the work of the President. He it was, too, who got up parlor meetings, not only in this city, but also in Boston, Providence, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, in which the reasons and scope and claims of the work were duly set forth in the hearing of a select company.

Dr. Schaff, as a member of the New Testament Company, took his share of the revision there carried on, but his most remarkable service was performed in securing ways and means and providing for what may be called the outside or general work of the committee. Here he showed himself a man of affairs, endowed with no small share of executive wisdom and tact. Often called to cross the ocean on matters connected with the Evangelical Alliance and the Alliance of the Reformed Churches, he on each occasion had personal communication with the personnel of the British Committee, and was enabled to lay before them the views of his American brethren. The final arrangement of the rights of each party in the publication of the Revised Version, respecting the insertion of an appendix containing the preferences of the American Committee and the limitation of the privilege of issuing an edition containing these preferences incorporated in the text to a period to commence thirteen years after the original issue, was made during Dr. Schaff's absence for several months in a visit to the East. Had he been here, I have little doubt that a more favorable arrangement would have been secured. His industry was unwearied, his tact

marvellous. What he did was done with his might. He spared no pains, and constantly surprised his colleagues on the committee with the fertility of his resources. The Revised Version of the English Bible is a great boon to all English-speaking peoples, as it puts in their possession in a convenient form the results of the scholarship of more than two centuries. Like all other works of men, it has its imperfections, but after a liberal allowance of these, it still remains a most important aid in acquiring the meaning of the sacred text. And for the American share in the work, the Christian public is indebted to Philip Schaff more than to all persons together. At the conclusion of the work, he put on record a *Documentary History*, which describes with faithful accuracy the various steps taken and the methods pursued in the accomplishment of the enterprise.

DR. SCHAFF AS UNITING TEUTONIC AND ANGLO-SAXON SCHOLARSHIP.

By Bishop JOHN FLETCHER HURST, D.D., LL.D.,

Of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

In the summer of 1843 there called at the plain and obscure study of a young man in Berlin two visitors from America. They were a committee in search of a professor of theology in the German Reformed Theological Seminary, in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. They had consulted Tholuck, Julius Müller, and Neander, as to the most fitting man for the position. All pointed to young Schaff. The delegates visited him to make the offer in person. Though only twenty-four years old, he had given strong proof of his ecumenical quality. A native of Switzerland, he had gone to Tübingen and Halle for his initial theological studies; had been drawn later to Berlin to complete them, under that "last of the Church Fathers," Neander; and had made an *iter academicum* to Italy. He was now entering upon his duties as an academic teacher in the University of Berlin. He accepted the call to America. But he was not to leave the Old World without giving still further proof of that intense cosmopolitan spirit which grew with his years and expanding knowledge. The young Teuton was already eager to learn of Anglo-Saxon theology. It was a prophecy of his later unifying power. He spent seven weeks in London and Oxford, the first of that long series of visits to England, where he was always received as a man of profound and varied scholarship, and where he was recognized as a connecting bond between the eastern and western hemispheres. In London he attended the May meetings, and there drank

in the spirit of aggressive and practical Anglo-Saxon Christianity. But Oxford had special charms. The Tractarian movement was then culminating. Both Rose and Pusey had been in Germany, and had written on the rationalism of the universities. With what eagerness must young Schaff have entered the historic town, and how soon must he have found his way into the presence of Pusey, Newman, Marriott, and the later leaders of the Broad Church—Dean Stanley and the recently deceased Jowett. He has himself said that what he heard and saw in England at this time was a revelation, and a preparation for his work in America.

Into the field of church history he now entered, with an enthusiasm at once beautiful and aggressive. He brought with him, as a church historian, an ardent devotion to the "development theory." Of course, Mercersburg must have it. In due time came whispers of heresy; then theological opposition; then a church trial; then an acquittal; and, of course, a growing fame. The professorship of historical theology in a country town was obscure enough in itself, but for the study of the American Church and for looking upon the Teutonic type of Christianity as the best exemplar for the Anglo-Saxon, no place could have furnished a safer perspective. That Pennsylvania should have already become the field in which German theology was first received on this continent was natural enough, in view of our colonial antecedents. The rich inheritance was a matter of course, and had all Europe now been searched for the best representative of Teutonic faith to give new form and life to Anglo-Saxon scholarship, none could have been found who in rare combination of scholarly qualities and graces of Christian character was more highly adapted to this providential service.

When William Penn, in 1677, preached the doctrines of Quakerism in Holland and Germany, and in later years prosecuted most industriously among the Germans along the Rhine his scheme for the colonization of his vast tract of land in the New World, now the State of Pennsylvania, he began a movement of great influence on the religious and

political development of the American colonies. How much, for example, the growth of anti-slavery sentiment, even as far back as the colonial period, is due to the Quakers, no historian has fully narrated. Certain it is, however, that the colonists in Pennsylvania who had come from Kirchheim, at Penn's earnest entreaty, were the first on American soil to declare it unlawful to hold slaves.

Penn's plan of colonization affected three confessions—the Quaker, the Lutheran, and the Reformed. While he labored for the conversion of the German immigrants to his Quaker doctrines, the great body of the colonists eventually coming from Germany was divided between adherents of the Augsburg and the Heidelberg confessions. The Lutherans came chiefly from the central parts of Germany, while the Reformed came from the Rhinelands, whose theology was taught principally in Heidelberg. While the Quakers developed in this country their own teachers, the "inner light," being of course independent of language and land, both Lutherans and Reformed looked habitually to the Fatherland for their best teachers and their clergy. That the German Reformed Church should reach an age ripe enough, and have in its fold men of vision clear enough to see the importance of Church history in the domain of theological studies, and then the wisdom to find the best man, is an evidence of guidance by the Divine Hand. But the wise men from the West came home with no provincial student. On the contrary, they brought with them the young man who was to become to both Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon theology the tireless Jerome of the modern Church.[1] His scholarship became as broad as both hemispheres. He appreciated goodness in all lands. He had a sense of citizenship wherever the cross had won a race and a language. He possessed a sensitive and quick appreciation of worth in every confession. He never waited for compulsion, but

[1] In the congratulatory letter of the theological faculty of the University of Berlin, addressed to Dr. Schaff on the fiftieth anniversary of his academic teaching, he was likened to Jerome, "the great mediator between the Greek and Latin Church." Cf. *Semi-Centennial of Philip Schaff*, New York, 1893, p. 11.

turned always the other cheek and went joyfully the second mile. It is no wonder that his swan-song went far beyond the narrow limits of both Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon theology, and was nothing less than a plea for the "Reunion of Christendom." [1]

Dr. Schaff saw whatever of German theology was best to introduce into this country. Much of the rationalistic speculation which had prevailed since the reign of Wolf in Halle was wisely passed over, but the theology which had gained the upper hand through the Mediating School of Schleiermacher, Neander, Tholuck, Dorner, and others could be of infinite benefit to the young theology of the United States. In his *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund* [2] he gave fresh thoughts directly from the rich sources in the universities of Germany. In his *Religious Encyclopædia*,[3] and *Popular Commentary*,[4] he brought the popular treasures of the Old World to the heart and mind of the New. In his colossal *Bible Work* of *Lange* [5] he placed before the American Church the latest and ripest exegesis of the Teutonic mind. In his *Theological and Philosophical Library* [6] he gave to Van Oosterzee and Ueberweg a new and grateful constituency. In his *Germany* [7] he gave to multitudes of us our

[1] *The Reunion of Christendom*, a paper prepared for the Parliament of Religions and the National Conference of the Evangelical Alliance held in Chicago, September and October, 1893. New York, 1893.

[2] *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund*, Organ für die gemeinsamen Interessen der Amerikanisch-deutschen Kirchen. Mercersburg, Penn. 6 vols., 1848–54.

[3] *Religious Encyclopædia ;* or, Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology, Based on the *Real-Encyklopädie* of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck, in connection with Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson, and Rev. David Schley Schaff. 4 vols. New York, 1891.

[4] *International Illustrated Commentary on the New Testament.* 4 vols. New York and Edinburgh, 1879–82.

[5] *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical.* 25 vols. New York and Edinburgh, 1864–80.

[6] *Theological and Philosophical Library :* A Series of Text-Books, Original and Translated, for Colleges and Theological Seminaries. 5 vols. New York and London, 1871–74.

[7] *Germany : its Universities, Theology, and Religion.* With sketches of Neander, Tholuck, Olshausen, Hengstenberg, Twesten, Nitzsch, Müller, Ullmann, Rothe, Dorner, Lange, Ebrard, Wichern, and other distinguished divines of the age. Philadelphia, 1857.

first passion to cross the water, and go by a straight path to the feet of Tholuck, Jacobi, Dorner, Twesten, Nitzsch, Rothe, and other coryphaei of the later German theology. In his *Deutsches Gesangbuch*[1] and *Christ in Song*[2] he taught the adherents of all confessions to sing in harmony the songs of our common Christianity. Of Origen it is said that he comprehended in his theological activity, and by his travels, three continents. Of our Origen, who had no touch of Oriental fancy, it may be said that he brought the treasures of all continents to our shores, while to read his writings is in itself a theological training. As Polycarp, in extreme age, travelled from Smyrna to Rome to accommodate the growing differences between the Eastern and Western Churches, our Church Father went many a time back and forth between Europe and America to cultivate a broader brotherhood of theological scholarship, and in all to give to us here the latest and the choicest wheat in the granaries of Europe. As Erasmus and Martin Bucer bore to England the treasures of the Continent when Central Europe was in the agonies of the great Reformation, so our teacher, our wise student of the Reformation, brought to us and interpreted for us, the latest scholarship of the best Teutonic teachers.

One does not fail to find in such a career the fine element of permanence. Such tides of influence never cease. The time will not come when our students in theology shall feel themselves fully equipped for masterful service in the American Church without coming into close relation with our Teutonic masters. They live nearest the fountains. They know, as none others, the science of the division of theological labor. How to use what they write —what to receive and what to reject—our friend and teacher has with unerring skill taught not only us of to-day, but our successors forever. As in general literature future genera-

[1] *Deutsches Gesangbuch :* Eine Auswahl geistlicher Lieder aus allen Zeiten der Christlichen Kirche. Nach den besten hymnologischen Quellen bearbeitet und mit erläuternden Bemerkungen über Verfasser, Inhalt und Geschichte der Lieder versehen. Philadelphia, 1874.

[2] *Christ in Song.* Hymns of Immanuel. New York, 1868 ; London, 1869.

tions will remember Coleridge and Carlyle as first revealing to the Anglo-Saxon mind the wealth of German literature of the time of Goethe, Schiller, Herder, Wieland, and the whole Weimar pantheon, so will our friend—the youngest of us all in hope, and the senior of us all in charity—be remembered gratefully and affectionately as the first to bring to the Anglo-Saxon mind the theological treasures of the Fatherland.

DR. SCHAFF AND THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

By Rev. HENRY EYSTER JACOBS, D.D., LL.D.

No theologian, we believe it can be confidently asserted, was so familiar with the life and history of the churches that have found a home in America, as was Dr. Schaff. His name was pre-eminently that which would have been given by an intelligent representative of any of the larger communions as that of the one scholar outside of his Church who best knew it. His rare intellectual activity, his unwearied habits of research, and his marvellous memory were aided by his constant personal contact with leaders of the various phases of religious thought, and his warm sympathy for what he deemed the most essential factors of religious life wherever found.

But while this is true of his relations to all denominations, it may be justly claimed that those which he bore to the Lutheran Church were peculiarly intimate. There was much in Lutheranism that did not attract him, and which he never ceased to frankly criticise. This rendered his discriminating praise all the more grateful, as *e. g.* where he says, in his book on *Germany: its Universities, Theology, and Religion*:

"Lutheran piety has its peculiar charm, the charm of Mary who 'sat at Jesus' feet and heard his word.' If it is deficient in outward activity and practical zeal, and may learn much in this respect from the Reformed communion, it makes up for it by a rich inward life. It excels in honesty, kindness, affection, cheerfulness, and that *Gemüthlichkeit*, for which other nations have not even a name. The Lutheran Church meditated over the deepest mysteries of divine grace, and brought to light many treasures of knowledge from the mines of revelation. She can point to an un-

broken succession of learned divines who devoted their whole life to the investigation of saving truth. She numbers her mystics who bathed in the ocean of infinite love. She has sung the most fervent hymns to the Saviour, and holds sweet, child-like intercourse with the heavenly Father."

And of the Augsburg Confession, he wrote in his *Church History*[1]:

"It is the most churchly, the most catholic, the most conservative creed of Protestantism."

Dr. Schaff had exceptional opportunities for learning to know the Lutheran Church. He came under its influence in Germany during his boyhood. While a student in the Gymnasium at Stuttgart, he lived in a Lutheran family, within whose house the most prominent pastors and most earnest representatives of Wurtemberg Lutheranism were often found. His course at three universities brought him into close contact with the prominent representatives of both the confessions, as well as of the Prussian Union. He learned to know the weaknesses, as well as the strength, of the forms of Lutheranism then struggling in Germany.

His historical tastes raised him even then above mere partisan interests. He did not conceive it to be his duty to exalt the importance of the Reformed Confession by depreciating that of the Lutheran Church. All his sympathies were on the side of the Union, while, at the same time, his close observation and philosophical training enabled him to notice antagonisms that could not be as readily adjusted as his heart desired. He writes:

"The two Churches of the Reformation do not absolutely contradict each other, but admit of an ultimate reconciliation. They agree in all the essential articles of faith, and even some of their most prominent differences are more of a theological and scholastic, than of a religious and practical nature. . . . But they represent, on the other hand, two distinct ecclesiastical individualities or types of Christianity. The difference is by no means confined, as

[1] Vol. vi., p. 708.

some suppose, to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and the divine decrees. On the contrary, it runs through the whole system, and affects more or less the entire theology, organization, worship, and practical piety. It rests, we may say, on a different psychological constitution, and national basis, as much so as the distinctive peculiarities of the Greek and the Latin Churches may be traced back to the difference between the ancient Greek and Roman nationalities."[1]

Such were his convictions, doubtless already, when he came to America. His field of labor at Mercersburg, Pa., among the Reformed section of the Pennsylvania Germans, caused no diminution in his interest in the Lutheran Church, but only intensified it. The ideal before him was a vast one. It was the foundation and development of a German-American Church, uniting both confessions. The confusion between the two churches, which had existed in the Palatinate, whence a very large portion of the Pennsylvania Germans had emigrated, had been perpetuated. The rural churches were largely owned jointly by congregations of both confessions; the people were intermarried, and families of children divided according to the divergent confessions of their parents; a Union Hymn-Book for both confessions had been used; the Sunday Schools were Union Sunday Schools; and, not very many years before, it was seriously proposed to start a combined Lutheran and Reformed Theological Seminary, with a faculty to which each denomination should contribute an equal number of professors and directors. The project of a Union after the model of the Prussian Church had been suggested in influential quarters.

However earnest was Dr. Schaff's desire for a Union, he said that it must proceed from a basis different from that which had hitherto been contemplated. Nothing could be hoped for from mere indifferentism, or from any scheme that ignored plain historical facts. A German-American Church, in his view, was possible only in so far as it could

[1] *Germany: its Universities*, etc., pp. 167 *sqq*.

find a firm historical basis upon which to rest. The ability to establish its claims historically was, in his opinion then, a better guarantee for its permanence and efficiency than any mere ideal interests that were presented. Accordingly, he established in 1848 the theological journal *Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund*, which bears on its title-page the inscription: "Organ for the common interests of the American-German Churches." His chief co-laborer in this publication was a Lutheran, his former fellow-student in Germany, who had followed him to America, and into the German Reformed Church in this country, viz. Dr. William Julius Mann. Into Dr. Mann's hands, after his return to the Lutheran Church, Dr. Schaff subsequently transferred the editorship. We need scarcely say that, under such editors, it was a journal of rare ability. It was a bond connecting the German scholarship of America with that of Germany, transmitting to America the ripest fruits of German learning, and frankly criticising American tendencies—especially those in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches—from the standpoint of those who, with a deep sympathy with American institutions, and thorough loyalty to the churches they represented, nevertheless could see how far these churches had drifted, or were in danger of drifting, from their moorings. Among the contributors were Dr. Schaff's distinguished colleague, Dr. J. W. Nevin, Bishop Reichel of the Moravian Church, and Dr. J. W. Alexander of the Presbyterian Church. Especially interesting and significant was a series of articles from the pen of the first editor on the history of the German Church in America, in which the denominational factor is assigned an entirely subordinate place.

Dr. Schaff, as an historian, was never satisfied with giving a *résumé* of facts, or even with constructing upon them theories. In all his books, he is neither a mere annalist, nor a mere philosopher. Much of their charm is to be traced to their frank and fearless criticism. We can appreciate and admire this, even when we regard his generalizations too rapid. This characteristic is seen, in all its strength, in

this earlier period. He had learned from his historical studies what Lutheranism was, and he was unwilling to accept the interpretation of those who thought that the Lutheran Church of a later period could make its own creed and call that Lutheranism. Historical fidelity required that both Lutheran and Reformed theologians either be recalled to their historical positions, or abandon the titles which designated those positions. The confessional antitheses had to be revived in the interests of Christian union, in order that the adherents of each side might understand the other. Otherwise, with the confusion indefinitely prolonged, the best attempts of union must fail. As his colleague, Dr. Nevin, wrote:

"A Christianity that ignores and rejects in full the Lutheran element, can never be sound and whole. . . . All who take an interest in American Christianity must deprecate the idea of its being permanently divorced from the deep rich wealth of the old Lutheran creed. Our Reformed theology needs, above all things just now, for its support and vigorous development, the felt presence of the great Lutheran antithesis, as it stood at the beginning."[1]

But the Lutheran Church of America of that period had, in great measure, lost its consciousness of its historical position. Dr. Schaff, with all plainness, exposed the inconsistencies of what he calls "those American Lutherans, who disown every distinctive doctrinal feature of Lutheranism."[2] He found himself far more in harmony with Lutheran theology, than the leaders and spokesmen, in America, of what had hitherto been known in the English language as Lutheranism.

In his lectures on "America: Political, Social, and Religious," delivered in Berlin in 1854, he presented an analysis of the various elements of which the Lutheran Church of that period was composed. However severely this was

[1] *Life of J. W. Nevin*, by Theodore Appel, pp. 308 *sqq.*

[2] *Germany: its Universities*, etc., p. 169.

criticised at the time, we believe that a careful review will show that he was in general correct. Those who know how deeply Dr. Schaff's heart was set upon Christian Union may at first seem surprised at the vigor with which he attacks a tendency then at its height, that especially gloried in its advocacy of such union. A union which he thought absolutely false to the facts of history was one with which he had no sympathy.

In the powerful reaction that came in the Lutheran Church in America, leading it back towards its historical foundations, the influence of Dr. Schaff must be regarded as a very important factor.

All this does not mean that Dr. Schaff was in full sympathy with the results that were reached. Dr. Schaff was not a Lutheran, and never ceased to protest against certain peculiarities in the Lutheran Church. He did not admire, we regret to say, the Formula of Concord; he was never convinced that the Lutheran Church did not teach consubstantiation; he introduces his protests against the Galesburg Rule at most unexpected places in his books. But there is not a Lutheran scholar in America, especially among those who use the English language, who does not owe to Dr. Schaff an inestimable debt. Dissent as we may from individual statements and opinions, oppose as we may movements that he regarded promotive of the progress of Christianity, when we consider the entire compass of his work in all its variety and richness and stimulus, we thank God that he lived and labored here so long, and that he has left his permanent impress upon the religious thought of America.

It is neither the exegete nor the dogmatician, who is of highest service in bringing together the various forms of Christianity, and effecting a reconciliation of divided interests. Theology is throughout an historical science, and it cannot be understood except by an historical interpretation. If the differences which separate Christian men are ever to be adjusted, it must be by the discriminating study of the mode in which the various Church parties and the various Church

doctrines have assumed their present forms. The result will be often that seeming agreements will be found to be heaven-wide disagreements, and, conversely, seeming contradictories will be found to be harmonies. Everything in Christianity must be brought to the touch-stone, not only of Holy Scripture, but also of history, and of a history so conscientious, that no link is overlooked and no fact suppressed.

The influence of this high standard of Dr. Schaff, which the Lutheran Church felt so soon, has pervaded an ever widening circle among the Christian scholars of America. We are convinced that it will not cease with his death. May we not look for the rise and development of an American school of Church historians, to continue the work which he began, with results of the highest moment to our common Christianity?

DR. SCHAFF AND THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

By Rev. C. C. TIFFANY, D.D.

Concerning the Episcopal Church Dr. Schaff writes as follows, in his "Paper on the Reunion of Christendom," prepared for the Parliament of Religions and the National Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in Chicago September and October, 1893:

"The Episcopal Church of England, the most churchly of the Reformed family, is a glorious Church, for she gave to the English-speaking world the best version of the Holy Scriptures and the best Prayer Book; she preserved the order and dignity of the ministry and public worship; she nursed the knowledge and love of antiquity, and enriched the treasury of Christian literature; and by the Anglo-Catholic Revival under the moral, intellectual, and poetic leadership of these shining lights of Oxford, Pusey, Newman, and Keble, she infused new life into her institutions and customs, and prepared the way for a better understanding between Anglicanism and Romanism."

Lest, however, this general charity of expression and cordial recognition of service might seem to commit our departed friend to a too favorable endorsement of Anglican claims, we do well to read from the same paper his remarks on the "Four Anglican Articles of Reunion," which indicate his own apprehension of the value and validity of Episcopal ordination. After quoting the four conditions originally set forth by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church assembled in Chicago, 1886, and adopted and promulgated by the last Lambeth Conference, 1888, with some verbal alterations, he remarks:

"The only serious difficulty is the 'historic Episcopate.' This is the stumbling-block to all non-Episcopalians and will never be conceded by them as a condition of Church unity, if it is understood to mean the necessity of three orders of the ministry and of Episcopal ordination in unbroken historic succession. . . . As to an unbroken Episcopal succession, it is of little avail without the more important succession of the spirit and life of Christ, our ever present Lord and Saviour, who is as near to his people in the nineteenth century as he was in the first. Even where two or three are gathered together in his name, he is in the midst of them. *Ubi Christus, ibi Ecclesia.*"

He adds in a note this historic judgment:

"The preface to the ordinal to the Episcopal Church is not sustained by the facts of history when it affirms that 'it is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and Ancient Authors, that *from the Apostle's times* there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.'"

He concludes with the expression of the following sentiments:

"All respect for the historic Episcopate. It goes back in unbroken line almost to the beginning of the second century and no one can dispute its historical necessity or measure its usefulness. But God has also signally blessed the Lutheran, the Presbyterian, and the Congregational ministry for many generations, and what God hath blessed let no man lightly esteem. The non-Episcopal Churches will never unchurch themselves and cast reproach upon their ministry. They will only negotiate with the Episcopal Church on the basis of equality and a recognition of the validity of their ministry. It is hoped that the Episcopal Church will give the historic Episcopate as 'locally adapted,' such a liberal construction as to include the 'historic Presbyterate' which dates from the Apostolic age and was never interrupted. . . . In any case we hail the Episcopal proposal as an important step in the right direction, and as a hopeful sign of the future."

I have quoted these various passages from one of the last utterances of our revered friend, not to controvert or approve them, but simply to indicate his own position towards the Episcopal part of Christ's kingdom. It was a position of cordial recognition of the great services of the Anglican Communion in its various branches to Christian life and Christian scholarship, a recognition not grudgingly given, but heartily appreciative, yet not including agreement with either the importance or necessity of the Anglican Ecclesiastical claim. He quotes Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham, with approval of his recognition of the original identity of bishops and presbyters, but he does not agree with him that even in Asia Minor the elevation of a chief presbyter of the College of Presbyters, as Bishop "had probably the approval of the last of the Apostles, St. John, though there is no reason for supposing that any direct ordinance was issued to the churches." In his *Church History* his statement of facts during the early ecclesiastical development of the Church has been by many churchmen claimed as a warrant for their own interpretation and theory. Dr. Schaff, however, did not so consider them. But apart from such special recognition and agreement, there was much to call forth his hearty admiration of many of the special features of the Episcopal family.

His historic spirit was much drawn to a Church which lays so much emphasis on the historic development of the Church. Its own interpretation of certain of its historic features might not commend itself to his judgment, but its method of approach was thoroughly congenial to him. He breathed its historic atmosphere with delight. There was in him no Puritan acerbity of detraction, either of its orders or its offices. He looked upon the Anglican Church as a pure and genuine outcome of the Reformation. He rejoiced in the early cordiality of the English Reformers in their intercourse with the Reformers of the Continent, in the calling of Martin Bucer from Strassburg to the chair of systematic theology in the University of Cambridge, and of Peter Martyr to the University of Oxford. In Cranmer's

intercourse with Melancthon, which so largely influenced and moulded the form of the Thirty-nine Articles, and in his admiration of Luther, which has left its indelible imprint on the Baptismal Service of the Prayer Book. I think he would have preferred the statements of the Thirty-nine Articles, though so far less systematic and thorough, to the elaborated system of the Westminster Confession, because the former was the historic statement of the Reformed position, indicative of the historic circumstances which occasioned it; the latter a philosophical digest of a later Puritan theology, just as he preferred the Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions to the decrees of the Synod of Dort. No one who has the historic spirit but delights in continuity, and hence the English Church Reformed was more interesting to this Reformed historian than the ecclesiastical fragments which from time to time broke off from it, no matter what sympathy he may have had with the cause of their departure.

The historic continuity of the Anglican Communion, which stamped its Protestantism with a positive rather than a negative character; which characterized its Reformation chiefly as a protest *for* the old faith, and so incidentally a protest *against* Rome, which, as they thought, obscured or perverted that faith; which made it first of all an affirmation of the Christianity of the New Testament and the primitive Church, and so of necessity a denial of the Roman tenets, which according to their view beclouded or falsified it; it was this which gave it to our friend the marks of genuineness and dignity, which appealed so strongly to his historic spirit. There was an atmosphere about it which inspired him with reverence, and his was no iconoclastic spirit which loved to deface its features or decry its usages. And moreover there was that about its worship which appealed strongly to the liturgical habit in which he had as a youth been bred, which led him to bestow so much labor on the revision and compilation of the German Reformed liturgy in the United States, and which made him often a devout and delighted worshipper in the churches where the Book of Common

Prayer is used. Thus the ἦθος of the Episcopal Church was congenial to him, and caused him to emphasize far more his bond of union with it than the lines of separation which parted him from it.

And so he lived in terms of warmest friendship with many of the Episcopal clergy about him, and not a few of its most distinguished dignitaries and scholars abroad. Engaged in the work of the revised version of the Holy Scriptures, he met many of these distinguished Englishmen and made lasting friends among them. Perhaps the late Dean Stanley, with Lady Augusta Stanley, his wife, were his most intimate friends in England, but he knew well and visited both at the University of Cambridge, and afterward, when he had become Bishop of Durham, at Auckland Castle, the great biblical and historical scholar, Dr. Lightfoot; his successor in the See of Durham, Bishop Westcott, was also his friend, Bishop Ellicott as well, and also the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Tait, who entertained him at Lambeth. From the present Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Benson, he received a friendly epistle shortly before his death, and Dean Bradley and Archdeacon Farrar, of Westminster, Canon Fremantle of Canterbury, and others eminent at the universities were his frequent correspondents.

Here, too, he was not without honor among his Episcopal brethren. Bishop Potter was a warm and lasting friend of his, and also the late Dr. Washburn of Calvary Church, one of the brightest scholars the Protestant Episcopal Church has ever possessed. The last time I ever saw him was at the session of our late Diocesan Convention, where he had come to see and hear what the Greek Archbishop of Zante, who was on the platform with the Bishop, might say. When I approached him to bid him welcome, he said: "Am I out of place here?" I was glad to be able to assure him that he could be out of place nowhere in our assembly and to invite him to a more prominent seat.

He was in fine a friend to all to whom his Master's cause was dear; no portion of His kingdom was without interest to him, or apart from his sympathy. As our thought follows

him to the spiritual world into which he has entered, every one must feel that he was eminently fitted to mingle in the *General* Assembly and Church of the First-Born, being bound by sympathy and love with each member of it, and by the whole tenor and spirit of his life made ripe for participation in so catholic a companionship.

DR. SCHAFF AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

By Rev. THOMAS JOSEPH SHAHAN, D.D.

More eloquent tongues than mine have already paid due tribute to the memory of the venerable scholar, whose great learning and manly virtues we can all unite in praising, without regard to religious or scientific differences, however profound and essential they may be. I will not dwell upon the historical training, the grasp of scientific method, and the ripe scholarship which were distinctive of Dr. Schaff, nor upon his sincere sympathy for the spiritual and religious element in the history of human thought, nor upon the uprightness of his historical conscience, and his desire to be objective and candid in the statement of views which were not his own,—these are the primary qualities which we demand of a Church historian, and especially of one who assumes the delicate and responsible office of an historian of theology. You have requested me to speak of the deceased in his relations with the Catholic Church, and I propose to confine myself to a brief enumeration of the motives why that Church respects such men as Dr. Schaff. He devoted his life in a great measure to the history, the theology, and the original texts and sources of the earliest Christian ages, those distant but all important years when the foundations of the Catholic Church were being sunk, and the great beams were being laid on which she has since arisen. He endeavored to bring back the minds of men to a consideration of those primitive days when there was but one spirit and one heart in the Christian body, when belief and discipline, religious life and organization, were substan-

tially of the same type in all the Christian communities. Such literary labors have always been in honor in the Catholic Church. She sees with satisfaction this return to the study of her origins, and is confident that it will end eventually in an historical justification of many doctrines and customs for which she has been made to suffer severely. I need only point to the conduct of Leo XIII., whose elevated and luminous language on the study of Church history, and whose conduct in throwing open the greatest repository of Church documents, the Vatican Archives, to the researches of the scholars of every creed and race are sufficient proof of the practical interest which the Catholic Church actually takes in such matters. Dr. Schaff himself was enabled to make use of this venerable collection, and, if I remember well, took occasion to express his gratitude therefor in a learned communication to the *Presbyterian Review.*

On different occasions the deceased, it is remembered with gratitude by Catholics, corrected misstatements of their doctrines, and rebuked exaggerated and false notions concerning them. They were then, as they are now, in a minority in this country, and it is an unhappy trait of human experience that minorities are too easily believed to be wrong, and their reasons to be as weak as their number is small. It is all the more honorable, I take it, if one who is on the popular and successful side lifts up a voice of protest in defence of the inalienable rights of truth and justice, whenever he sees a wrong done to these divine sisters.

Perhaps, if the opinions of this honorable assembly were individually taken, most would agree that the dominant desire in the heart of Dr. Schaff was the reunion of Christendom. His writings were meant by him to tone down the asperities of a secular polemic, to smooth out the rugged lines of doctrine and experience, to increase the sum of Christian charity, and pave the way for that blessed time when the centuries of dissension shall be forgotten in the plenitude of unity and love. The journeys he undertook, and the personal efforts he made to bring about some unity

within the circle of his own influence, are well known. The lives and writings of such men must be taken as a whole, not carpingly examined in detail, and I do not hesitate to say that from this view-point Dr. Schaff belongs in the same category with men like George Calixtus, Grotius, and Leibnitz, whose efforts for the reunion of Christians the Catholic Church remembers with sympathy, while she regrets their untimely failure.

The Catholic Church most ardently desires the healing of the religious divisions which so unhappily afflict Christendom. Before the Vatican Council Pius IX. made a formal appeal in this sense to all the separated brethren, and the constant efforts of the papacy to bring back to the original unity the churches of the Orient are well known. But while she believes that it must not be done at the sacrifice of what she considers to be principle and truth, she is only too glad to approve those previous conditions which Dr. Schaff sets down at the end of his little brochure on the Reunion of Christendom, and which may be said to sum up the results of his long and laborious efforts in this direction. In this last work of his pen he tell us that the preliminaries of so desirable an event must be the cultivation of an irenic spirit, the weeding out of prejudice, a willingness to allow for diversity of education and surroundings, cooperation in all that pertains to the common weal of humanity, an attentive study of Church history and comparative theology; above all, prayer. Surely if this state of mind ever obtains in any large measure, an Astræan reign will have set in, and we may look forward to the near realization of the prayer of Jesus Christ, efficacious and splendidly operative for a thousand years, that all might be one as He and the Father are one. In conclusion, I will say, that while the Catholic historian and theologian finds much from which he must dissent in the writings of Dr. Schaff, still, when he considers his natural and acquired abilities, his earnest zeal, his manliness, his astounding productivity, he is tempted to exclaim :

Talis cum sis, utinam noster esses.

DR. SCHAFF AS A LITERARY WORKER.

By E. C. RICHARDSON, Ph.D.,
Librarian of College of New Jersey.

My acquaintance with Dr. Schaff was not as long as that of some of those who have read papers at this meeting, but it extended over eight years, and was developed under circumstances various enough to give some clear impressions of the scholar, and of the man. I met him at the Hartford Seminary and at Union Seminary, at his own table and at the Century Club, in Washington, in New York, and in London—here, there, and everywhere. I knew him as host and as guest, as junior partner in literary work and in plans for the promotion of theological learning, and as friendly gossip, interested in the shrewd views which he expressed on every topic under the sun, and pleased (not to confess flattered) to surrender to his all-embracing interrogations whatever was of interest to him.

If I were to single out the one thing about his personal disposition which came oftenest to the front as characteristic, it would be his readiness to speak a good word for a man. He was always genial and friendly, but perhaps not more so than others. For that friendliness, however, which is alert and ingenious to drop to you a good word on behalf of the reputation or prospects of another, or for you to others, he was certainly unusual. Perhaps one might have come to distrust such general commendation, if it were not that it was joined with a certain shrewd discrimination, and perhaps one might find himself now and then proposed for some position which he had no notion of wanting, but his speaking was never troublesome, and was often helpful. It was

just a constant kindly disposition to remember to say a good word for a man, and this word was the making of more than one. The number of men having more or less favorable positions of influence to-day, who, if the history were traced, would be found to owe their opportunity to that word of Dr. Schaff, must be considerable.

If again I were to speak of Dr. Schaff as a scholar and writer, it would be to speak of those aspects of his literary character which are of peculiar interest to me as a librarian, *i. e.*, of Dr. Schaff as a bibliographer, and, what is closely akin, of Dr. Schaff as an encyclopædist. By encyclopædist I do not refer particularly to that recent work on encyclopædia (*Propædeutic*, 1893), which was a fitting outgrowth of his scholarly life, but to the whole character of his work. This might perhaps be expressed by saying that he was a synthetic writer rather than analytic. His work was rather to do many things better than any one else would, than to do any one thing better than any one else could, or rather this very thing was his specialty—the thing which he did better than any one else could have done.

For he had the spirit and habit of universality. He was ubiquitous in person. You could not travel without meeting him, or finding that he had been there—London, Oxford, or Cambridge, Stuttgart, Berlin, or for that matter, Upsala, St. Petersburg, or Rome. He was ubiquitous in reputation. In Glasgow or Durham, or in the little village of the Bavarian Alps, as an American, you would be asked, "Do you know Dr. Schaff?" And he was equally ubiquitous in mind. In every branch of theology which you might investigate, in every department of this branch, you found that he had visited there, and he was always travelling and retravelling the literature of all lands, garnering information for his encyclopædic purposes.

With this encyclopædic approach to his subject, he united the bibliographic sense. He had the faculty of choosing out the work which would be useful to him. I remember my first meeting with him when he came to Hartford to use the Seminary collection of Reformation literature. I remember

not only the keen interest which he took in conversation, the alert activity of questioning so long as there was any juice left in the topic, but also the skill with which he chose, from the mass, the books which would be serviceable to him. He had a real instinct in the use of secondary sources, and a method in his use or neglect of the primary ones. And he knew as well how to use men in gathering information. He had the rare art of using a librarian.

It is hardly necessary to recall the undertakings to which he applied this encyclopædic and bibliographical genius, and which would not have been done except for him—the *Lange Commentaries*, the *Religious Encyclopædia*, the *Creeds of Christendom*, the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, and the *American Church History Series*. Some of these will never be superseded, and others he has arranged to have kept up to date. Altogether, Dr. Schaff will live in the hearts of his friends on account of his geniality and ready kindliness, and will live long in the literary memory of mankind, on account of his monumental works of reference, and the unique genius which brought these to completion.

PAPERS READ AT THE REGULAR SESSIONS

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1893

I

LIFE AND WORK OF BISHOP FRANCIS ASBURY

LIFE AND WORK OF BISHOP FRANCIS ASBURY.

By Rev. ASBURY LOWREY, D.D.

Among the creators of the American nation is Bishop Francis Asbury. Not as a discoverer, a military chieftain, a philosopher, a legislator, or diplomatist, but as a purifier of the nation's morals in its germ. While a galaxy of great men like George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Jay, and Alex. Hamilton were fighting for liberty, laying the foundation of government and building up a peerless system of free institutions, Asbury was devoting himself assiduously to the culture of the nation's heart. Nor did he do this with towering intellect like that of Jonathan Edwards, or classic writing like that of Timothy Dwight, or flaming oratory like that of George Whitefield, but by simple unsophisticated preaching, prayer, and expostulation throughout the length and breadth of the colonies and infant States.

Respectable nations are not made by fleets and armies, nor by revolutions with new governments, laws, and institutions, but by the personal purity and rectitude of the inhabitants. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

Asbury was a clear, but mellow light, not brilliant at any time; but soft, insinuating, widely diffused and hallowing. Any historian who undertakes to enumerate the formative forces of this nation and leaves out of his calculation Francis Asbury and his immediate coadjutors, writes an incomplete history.

Bishop Asbury's chief work was to purify American society in its genesis. He was a great foundation builder and

primitive organizer. He planned wisely for a superstructure but had no material with which to do more than begin the erection, and that of necessity was small and rude in his lifetime.

Viewing the Methodist Episcopal Church as it now is in this country, we have the finest possible illustration of the universal truth, "that one soweth and another reapeth." And in nothing are we more forgetful than of the sower in such cases. Who thinks of the unsightly bud when the flower has bloomed? Who gives to Asbury the meed of honor that belongs to him?

Francis Asbury was an Englishman, and belonged to the middle class of the English population. He was born in Hansworth Parish in Staffordshire, England, Aug. 20, 1745. His parents were devoted Christians and attached Methodists. His father was a farmer and gardener. They lived in rural tranquillity and frugal comfort. They early sat under the ministry of the first Methodist preachers, chiefly those of the Calvinistic wing, of which Lady Huntingdon and Whitefield were principal representatives. His parents were intelligent, his mother especially was passionately fond of books. Both appreciated education, and Francis being their only son, they proposed, if possible, to give him a liberal education. A trivial incident prevented; and settled for ever the fact and misfortune that the great pioneer Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the first Bishop of that denomination ordained in this country, was not scholastically educated, except in the rudiments of scholarship, which he obtained at Barre, near his birthplace. After he entered upon his life-work, however, he was studious, and progressing in useful knowledge, mastered Greek and Hebrew, and became versed in general literature. He evidently did not lack educational qualifications for his high office.

Asbury was born to do and dare. He was predestinated to a life of hard, rustic work, and in his adaptability, taste, and endurance for such work lay the greatness of the man. Neither of the Wesleys, nor Fletcher, nor Adam Clarke, nor Watson, nor Joseph Benson, nor Whitefield, nor any of the

founders of Methodism, could have done the work which he did. For any of those polished shafts to have taken his place would have been like crossing the ocean and attempting to fell the American forests with a Sheffield razor. Asbury, by instinct, was a wilderness preacher, like John the Baptist, capable, if necessary, of dressing in camel's hair and substituting a leathern girdle for buttons, and living on locusts and wild honey. John the Baptist was better adapted to be the forerunner of Christ than a white-winged angel. So Asbury was better fitted for his peculiar task by his rural residence, simple religious training and artisan and agricultural service, than he would have been had he remained longer in the old country, and finally emerged from the lordly halls of Oxford or Cambridge, but sadly lacking adaptability. It is unpopular to say so in these days.

And yet if we study the philosophy of success, we shall see there must be a correspondence between the preacher and people. The language of the schools is often incomprehensible and unattractive to the common people. It puts the apples too high on the tree to be reached by those who stand on the ground.

An intelligent analysis of the rapid and marvellous spread of Methodism in primitive times, will show that it resulted largely from the use of a direct *ad captandem vulgus* style by its preachers. Simple home thrusts were the staple of their sermons. Being generally uneducated, in the modern acceptation of that term, they were obliged to use the colloquial speech, and as they always pushed for immediate results, they dealt largely in exhortation and solemn appeal; at the same time and always depending absolutely upon the unction from the Holy One for power and success. Such was the preaching of Francis Asbury.

Asbury was rushed into his life-work almost from his cradle. Converted at thirteen, made a local preacher at eighteen, entered the itinerant ministry at twenty-one, appointed missionary to America by John Wesley at twenty-six; and only one year later, made assistant of the whole Wesleyan mission work in the Colonies.

While he was hurried on and hastily sped across the ocean, sadly lacking a collegiate education, he had received in the wise providence of God what was even more important—a thorough spiritual endowment and evangelistic training. He was converted in his father's barn. Immediately after, he began to hold meetings in his father's house and in adjacent places. He got the full benefit of class and band meetings, particularly the latter. He attended a band society in Wednesbury, a hamlet contiguous to his home. A band is a select company of spiritual Christians, who meet statedly under a covenant to tell each the other his faults, to advise and counsel reciprocally, and then kneel down and pray specifically and by name for each one, adapting the prayers to the needs of each as made known and lovingly considered. It is identical with the primitive class meeting, except that the communications are more frank, particular, and mutually searching. It aims at producing a more exact and sacred life.

In this drill the youth continued four or five years, radiating like a sunbeam into three counties, Staffordshire, Worcestershire, and Derbyshire; doing an amount of toil which seems almost incredible. At the bidding of the ministers he went far and near, both as helper or supply, preaching four and five times a week, and at the same time doing his daily task as an apprentice. His mechanic art was the manufacture of buckle-chapes—a part of a buckle frame variously used.

At twenty-one he was admitted into the itinerancy, and travelled three circuits under the rigorous discipline of John Wesley.

During all these preparatory years, dating back to his conversion in his father's barn, he heard and read of the want of missionaries in America. His heart warmed to the holy enterprise, and long before any one suggested to him the transatlantic mission, he said in his heart, "That is my field."

In 1771 the sagacious Wesley, at his Bristol Conference, chose and appointed young Asbury to the American mission.

The next year he assigned to him the general supervision of all the preachers and societies in America. Thirteen years afterwards Wesley ordained Thomas Coke a general superintendent, and sent him over to ordain Francis Asbury a joint superintendent, who, by virtue of his priority on the ground and the election of the General Conference, soon took precedence and became the first Bishop made and ordained on American soil for the Methodist Episcopal Church.

As soon as Asbury received his appointment he hastened home to acquaint his parents of his destination and receive their consent and blessing. He re-visited many places, and held powerful meetings where, as a boy, he had been instrumental in saving souls. His friends were amazed at his long and hazardous undertaking, but no one attempted to dissuade him. He parted from them and took leave of his sorrowing mother and father. The separation proved to be final. He never went back to England, and now the ocean denies even the fellowship of their dust. The Lord seems to have said to Asbury, "Let the dead bury their dead, follow thou me."

Asbury was too poor and too utterly destitute of missionary outfit to consume much time in preparing to depart. A few religious meetings and a few affectionate farewells sufficed to close his connection with his home and native land and start him on his long voyage, never to be retraced. What an adieu that must have been, especially for his mother. Francis was her only boy. He had proved himself pure, manly, and eminently promising. He had commended himself to the sage and discerning Wesley. His mother was a tender and sympathetic woman. Asbury was considerate of her feelings. When he received his credentials, he writes: "I went home to acquaint my parents with my great undertaking, which I opened in as *gentle* a manner as possible. Though it was grievous to flesh and blood, they consented to let me go. My mother is one of the tenderest parents in the world, but I believe she was blessed in the present instance with Divine assistance to part with me."

The trial, it is evident, must have torn asunder bleeding heart-strings. It was a last kiss, a last look. The bereaved woman had nothing to lure away her affections, or divert her thoughts. No riches, no worldly glitter, no absorbing companionship. Francis was all the world to her. Imagine the desolation that settled down upon her soul when he faded from her eyes, all red and blind with weeping, at the cottage door. She could only think of him as going to expose himself to the dangers of the sea, and then if safely landed, as plunging into the dark wilderness swarming with wild and ravenous beasts and more wild and ravenous Indians. True, as a woman of faith, she could, and doubtless did, think of him as consecrated to God and left in His hands, but that could not dry a fond mother's tears, nor heal the maternal sadness of heart. Grace enables to endure, but does not make us unnatural. I wonder if she had any presentiment that her son would plant a Church which would soon become one of the largest, the most spiritual and aggressive in Christendom. It is certain she died without the sight, and it is probable without the imagination, of these coming glories to be started by her boy. It is well these honors were hid from her eyes. Had she known his historic fame as we know it now, she might have become vain and haughty. As it was, Asbury begat a Church and died the plainest of men, just as Washington begat a nation and died the meekest of soldiers. These great creators were patriotic contemporaries, and not unlike.

One great in goodness and in war
The people's liberty espoused ;
The other, full of mighty prayer,
Their guilty consciences aroused.

Both lie in honored graves renowned,
A sweet repose, not wide apart ;
Both with peerless glory crowned,
Live in a grateful people's heart.

After hasty preparation, and a tender parting from affectionate parents and Christian friends, Francis Asbury made

his way to Bristol, where he was to embark for America September 4, 1771. And here begins the unfolding of the heroic element of his character. He reached the sea-coast without a penny to pay his expenses to the new world, and even without sufficient clothing or bedding to protect him from the severities of the voyage. He had nothing but faith in God to uphold him. No rich parents, no wealthy church, no strong missionary society to back him. He started out single-handed and alone, not knowing what awaited him. Still the resolute man was bound to go. Such a spirit always triumphs, and in this case, under the prompting of God's Spirit, it soon raised up friends to assist. They gave him clothes and a purse of ten pounds, about forty-seven dollars. Thus he writes: "I found by experience the Lord will provide for those who trust in Him." And what a provision! He had but two blankets. With these he slept on the hard boards during the entire trip of fifty days. He preached often on board, and spent his time, he says, in "study, retirement, and prayer." The vessel was his training college and church, the billows his organ, the old tars his congregation. He evidently was tested by his hardships, for he writes after his embarkation: "I want faith, courage, patience, meekness, and love. When others suffer so much for their temporal interests, surely I may suffer a little for the glory of God and the good of souls." It puts fortitude, all devout and invincible, into a missionary to be convinced that he is sent of God. Asbury was fully persuaded that his undertaking was not of himself. He writes on shipboard: "I have great cause to believe I am not running before I am sent." A Divine propulsion was behind him. His mission was made easy and delightful because his heart was in it. He says while on the water: "I feel my spirit bound to the new world, and my heart united to the people, though unknown." His affections flowed westward faster than the ship sailed. He lived and rejoiced in anticipation of hard work and glorious results. His poverty and privations were forgotten. He was wholly given up to God and absorbed by his prospects, which expanded before

his vision like a green and sunlit landscape full of fruit and flowers.

No man was ever more sincere or unworldly. When only eight days out at sea he analyzed his motives and wrote: "Whither am I going? To the new world. What to do? To gain honor? *No*, if I know my own heart. To get money? *No*. I am going to live to God, and to bring others so to do! If God does not acknowledge me in America I will soon return to England. I know my views are upright now. May they never be otherwise." Such was the beginning of this pioneer missionary and primitive Bishop.

Asbury left England September 4th, and landed in Philadelphia October 27th, being at sea fifty-five days. When he approached the American coast tears flowed, and his heart leaped for joy. The discomforts of the voyage were forgotten, and the high purpose for which he had chosen his occidental field of labor occupied his thoughts and filled him with tender emotions. He writes: "When I came near the American shore my very heart melted within me, to think whence I came, where I was going, and what I was going about. But I felt my mind open to the people, and my tongue loosed to speak." He must have felt much as St. Paul did when he said to his western brethren at Rome: "I am sure when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulf ness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ."—Rom. xv., 29.

No preparation for Gospel work is more indispensable than a heart surcharged with the fulness of the Gospel of Christ, and a soul bounding forth like a charger in battle to enter upon it. A man who goes at any religious service like a whipped spaniel, or goaded ox, or conscript soldier, is sure to make a failure. Asbury forsook all, and went for life, and went with gladness.

He met with a cordial reception in Philadelphia. He records: "The people looked on us with pleasure, hardly knowing how to show their love sufficiently, bidding us welcome with fervent affection and receiving us as the angels of God."

With most readers this reception will pass as an episode or formal greeting; but in this case it meant much more. Indeed, had Asbury been received coldly, as might have been expected when the antagonism of the colonies to the mother country was at white heat, and rising rapidly, the Methodist Episcopal Church might never have been organized. We have seen that Asbury, while on shipboard, made his permanent stay in America contingent upon his being acknowledged of God as an instrument of usefulness. Had the infant societies repulsed him as an English Tory, or given him a chilling reception as a foreigner, he might have received it as an indication that the country was not ripe for the service which he came to render, and under that impression turned back, as all Wesley's ministers did at the breaking out of the war, except himself. A pebble turns the course of rivers. Francis Harris, of Philadelphia, was the first man to entertain Francis Asbury in the new world. We would like to know the history of that man and his family. He unconsciously opened his home to a stranger who was to begin an epoch in the religious realm only second to that caused by the revolutionary war in civil affairs in this country. Francis Harris "entertained an angel unawares."

Asbury was conducted the same night to St. George's Chapel, yet standing, where Pilmoor, a preacher previously sent over by Wesley, preached. It was a big shell of a church which Captain Webb had assisted to purchase. It was only partly floored and seated. Here the young man of destiny made his debut and began that wonderful career of toil, suffering, and evangelization which has produced an achievement not equalled directly by even the Wesleys and Fletcher. From the day of his landing on our shores he travelled on an average six thousand miles a year. When too old and feeble to ride on horseback, he used a plain vehicle to carry him and his travelling companion through the woods and over the rough roads, abounding in roots and stones, and stumps and first-class mud. The climate was severe on him. Never robust, he was constitutionally susceptible to

the malarial diseases prevalent in new countries. The marshes of the East, the swamps of the South, and the muddy streams and stagnant waters of the Western woods preyed on him.

After remaining a few days in Philadelphia, he came through New Jersey to Staten Island, thence to York, as he calls New York in his journal, thence to New Rochelle, thence back and forth from this city to that, his rural home.

He was frequently stricken down with fevers, and was obliged often to go from the pulpit to his bed. His habit from the first was to preach every day, and sometimes twice a day, meeting the class after preaching in every place, and enforcing a strict discipline. The wonder is that he did not sink into a premature grave on the very threshold of his perilous undertaking. But nothing daunted him. No hardship or sickness could relax his energy or extinguish his zeal; on and on he went until he almost died in his carriage.

Asbury as a Christian and Evangelist.

The career of Asbury in this country was a continual glow of incandescent zeal and marvellous success. The light of the sun pales before it. Apostolic life and benedictions were no more lustrous and hallowing. From the time he landed in Philadelphia, in 1771, till God took him at Spottsylvania, Va., March 29, 1816, he was a beam of Divine light penetrating the western wilds, subduing and purifying society, and saving multitudes of lost souls. If ever the wilderness did literally bud and bossom as the rose, that blush of beauty followed the meanderings of Bishop Asbury, and was like fragrant flowers that "leave a long perfume." John Wesley himself did not do a greater work for England than Francis Asbury did for America. Wesley's work was more literary and profound; Asbury's more simple and elementary. Wesley wrestled with opposing scholars and preached the Gospel to the poor; Asbury encountered hostile Indians and rude white men, and preached

the Gospel to pioneer settlers. Wesley rode on good roads through a gardenesque country; Asbury waded through mud and swam rivers. Wesley formed numerous societies, which have never consolidated themselves into a Church proper; Asbury founded a vast Church with all the appliances of a grand organization.

The marvellous success of each was a miracle, the secret of their success was pre-eminent holiness and quenchless love of souls. The zeal of the Lord's house ate them up.

Asbury's Devotion.

Asbury was a seeker of what he calls entire devotion and deeper spirituality on shipboard. A few days before he landed he makes this record: "As to my own mind I long and pray that I may be more spiritual. But in this I comfort myself, that my intention is upright, and that I have the cause of God at heart; but I want to stand complete in all the will of God—'holy as He that hath called me is holy in all manner of conversation.' At times I can retire and pour out my soul to God, and feel some meltings of heart. My spirit mourns, and hungers, and thirsts after entire devotion."

He evidently felt like the Psalmist when he said: "My soul longeth, yea, even *fainteth* for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." The soul of Asbury was in such a frame at the time his feet touched our shores. He had a *passion* for *purity* and *power*. It was not long before he obtained the desire of his heart. Only a week later he writes: "I find my mind drawn heaven-ward. The Lord hath helped me by His power, and my soul is in paradise." Immediately he became concerned that the blessing should be permanent and lasting as life. He subjoins this prayer: "May God Almighty keep me as the apple of His eye till the storms of life are passed." This prayer was answered. His heart seems to have been constantly the seat of tranquillity and peace.

Accordingly Ashbury writes: "My heart seems wholly devoted to God, and He favors me with power over all outward and inward sin."

Itinerancy and Discipline.

From the moment Asbury arrived, and even before, his face was set as a flint to accomplish two things. First, to introduce what he called a circulating ministry. Second, to administer strict discipline. Having been drilled in John Wesley's stringent methods and witnessed their saving results, he believed these measures were indispensable to a national evangelism, and the establishment of a holy Church. There was a disposition among preachers then as now and ever, to nestle down in the cities. He found Pilmoor stationed in Philadelphia and Richard Boardman in New York. They came over in 1769 as missionaries pursuant to a call by John Wesley in his Conference for volunteers. They preceded Asbury by two years. Boardman being Wesley's assistant or superintendent, they had things all their own way, and were not willing to disperse their ministrations to any considerable extent. Asbury desired them and all his preachers to shoot out into the country like divergent rays of light. To effect this he found was difficult. It is hard to get men as well as wagons out of the ruts. Some ministers, it seems, would rather be stationed in a sickly city and die, than go into the country and live and prolong their usefulness. These Englishmen, no doubt, thought it utterly impracticable to itinerate through the pathless forests, turbid streams, and deep mire, after they had travelled on the smooth and hard roads that lie between the green hedges and shade trees of gardenesque England.

But Asbury was determined to effect the change and said: "*I will show them how to do it*"; and he did. He at once began to travel and preach every day and sometimes twice a day. He preached twice in coming from Philadelphia to New York. He stopped on Staten Island, preached and planted Methodism there before he entered the great city. After preaching in New York and regulating the Society he travelled on to New Rochelle, sowing, as he went and came, beside all waters.

From that period he commenced his annual visitations

through the Middle, the Western, the Southern, and the Eastern States. He was a daily preacher on horseback until he became so old and feeble that he could no longer endure that mode of transportation. Then he was rolled over roots and stones in a light wagon until literally he was lifted out of it and placed on a bed to die. The result of this policy enforced by example, was the formation of circuits, districts, Annual Conferences, and finally a Quadrennial General Conference.

We can imagine what a failure Methodism would have been in America had Asbury failed to establish the itinerancy. Asbury did not inaugurate the itinerancy. John Wesley did that. But so far as we can now see, the system would have entirely broken down but for Bishop Asbury's persistent resolution to uphold it. In nothing does the wisdom of the man shine with greater lustre than in his absolute refusal to abandon this method. It has proved itself to be the most effectual means ever devised for the rapid and universal spread of Christianity.

Doubtless some modifications became necessary, but it is a question whether the conversion of circuits into stations so universally has brought with it more good than evil. One thing is evident; just in proportion as we recede from our primitive system and other denominations approach it, we lose and they gain.

The primitive itinerancy was more than a constant succession of different preachers, more than a wide range of constantly recurring appointments. It meant in all cases after preaching to meet the Society. The habit was to preach, then dismiss the congregation, inviting the membership to tarry, and requesting all who desired to obtain religion and unite with the Church on probation to remain also. Thus sowing and reaping and feeding went on at the same time. The object was to ascertain the spiritual state of each member and to lead all seekers to Christ. The class meeting was often, and indeed usually, crowned with conversions and sanctifications. Asbury as faithfully met the Societies in his continental travels as he preached. What a

sublime spectacle! A Bishop feeding in tender detail the sheep and lambs of the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made him an overseer.

What exhausting labor that must have involved!

To ride constantly, preach every day, and nourish the infant Societies wherever he went by direct conversation with each individual.

Asbury's journal is full of thrilling reports of these Society meetings, and of the power of God which attended his preaching, especially during the great revival in Virginia, which occurred in 1776, right in the midst of the revolutionary war. He writes: "I preached from Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones; and there was a great shaking! I was obliged again and again to stop and beg the people to compose themselves, but they could not—some on their knees and some on their faces were crying mightily to God all the time I was preaching. Hundreds of negroes were among them with tears streaming down their faces.

"The same power we found in the Society meeting. Many were enabled to rejoice with joy unspeakable."

"This wonderful revival of religion," he says, "spread through fourteen counties in Virginia, and burnt its way into adjacent States. Eighteen hundred were added to the Society in one year. Above a thousand of those had found peace with God; many of whom thirsted for all the mind that was in Christ. And divers believed God had circumcised their hearts to *love* Him with *all* their *heart* and with all their *soul*."

Asbury was reputed a great preacher in those days. "A certain person," he writes, "passed great encomiums, and sounded my praises as a preacher to my face. But this is a dangerous practice, for it is easier for a preacher to think too much of his gifts than too little."

Another object which Asbury determined to accomplish was the *enforcement of discipline*. Pilmoor and Boardman had become lax and easy in this respect. By consequence, the Societies had become religiously demoralized. To counteract this Asbury was resolute and unyielding. He

says himself he had to become "as an iron pillar and a wall of brass." Trained under the administration of Wesley, he knew the value of discipline and set himself to maintain it. This rendered him somewhat unpopular. Preachers and societies did not relish his stringency. As a rule, all men, not excepting Christians, like an elastic government. Like horses, they become restive under a short check-rein. It was so in this case. Complaints were sent to Wesley; and under Rankin's short superintendency Wesley wrote two letters ordering Asbury to be sent home. But Asbury was hundreds of miles away in the interior and did not receive the letters. Soon Wesley changed his mind and appointed Asbury superintendent over all, and in that relation he continued till Dr. Coke was ordained and sent over to ordain him a joint superintendent.

At the breaking out of the revolutionary war all the other missionaries sent over by Wesley, as well as most of the ministers of other denominations, returned to England. Asbury stood fire literally in the hottest days of the war. He was neither a rebel nor a royalist declaratively, but a humble preacher of the Gospel "to every creature." He won on that line and became one of the first and greatest benefactors of our nation.

How much the Church is indebted to Asbury for his stern application of discipline! A Church without the enforcement of discipline is like a straggling army, spent and demoralized. It may be holy, but it is a holy mob. Had the Church begun under Asbury with our discipline as obsolete as it now is, the Methodist Episcopal Church would never have existed in any efficient sense. It might have taken form, but it would have been form without power—a "sounding brass and tinkling cymbal"; "a whited sepulchre, beautiful without, but within full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."—Matt. xxiii., 27.

Asbury as a Disciplinarian.

Asbury projected his influence far beyond his death. His close discipline governed the Church rigidly for fifty years,

and is felt, with much relaxation it is true, to this day. The ever weakening tension of her discipline is one of the most alarming aspects of the body.

If the Methodist Episcopal Church ever has the power again to make vast incursions into the territory of the wicked masses, as in primitive times, she will have to re-enact her discipline and regain her interior vitality.

Asbury as a Bishop.

The pretensions of Asbury as a bishop were moderate. No vaulting ambitions or arrogant assumptions characterized his elevation to office.

When Thomas Coke, Whatcoat, and Vasey arrived and announced to Asbury that Dr. Coke had been ordained General Superintendent by Wesley and sent over to ordain him also General Superintendent, he was surprised and added: "It may be of God." That supposition was natural, as he saw in it an end of the clamor for the sacraments, which, up to that time, no one sent over by Wesley had been qualified to administer. The Societies had pleaded for the sacraments as their right, and not receiving them, an agitation had arisen, threatening division and the erection of another church.

Asbury was not elated with the prospect of the proposed promotion. He records: "My soul is deeply engaged with God to know His will in this new business." He observed a day of fasting and prayer, and adds: "I am not tickled with the honor to be gained. I see danger in the way. My soul waits upon God. O that He may lead in the way we should go." He discussed with his friends the Episcopal mode of Church Government, and at night preached to the black people. In him these extremes of exaltation and humility met all through life. Asbury declined to be ordained General Superintendent without a unanimous election to that position by the General Conference. He was so elected. Dr. Coke had been previously appointed and ordained General Superintendent for America, but was not so recognized until the General Conference elected him also,

which they did unanimously. He was the last appointee from John Wesley. The Church being organized at the same time, 1784, it thereafter created its own functionaries.

Asbury had previously declared that should his election and ordination take place and the Church be organized, he would cease to act by the appointment of Mr. Wesley. He Americanized himself and built up an American Methodism. The colonies having declared themselves independent of the mother country, the infant Church did the same in its ecclesiastical relations. It assumed original powers. Asbury believed himself to be a true and scriptural bishop, but he did not trace the validity of his bishopric to an unbroken third-order ordination from the apostle. Nor did he believe that ordination imparts to its subject an indelible character which makes the man once a bishop always a bishop, whatever be his moral character. He believed with Lord King and Wesley that bishops and presbyters are the same order. And he accepted the doctrine of the great Hooker, that where transmitted authority is not available, and the spiritual exigencies of the case demand it, a body of Christians can originate a true Church and ministry.

And yet for the sake of regularity he accepted the ordination of Coke from Wesley and proceeded to ordain deacons and elders that they might administer the sacraments to the people.

At this point Asbury writes: "In this State (New York) the subjects of succession and rebaptism are much agitated. I will tell the world what I rest my authority upon.

"1. Divine authority.

"2. Seniority in America.

"3. The election of the General Conference.

"4. My ordination by Thomas Coke, William Philip Otterbine, German Presbyterian Minister, Richard Whatcoat, and Thomas Vasey.

"5. Because the signs of an apostle have been seen in me."

The theory of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been, ever since, that success is the best proof of succession. She claims her apostolic descent by saying to her children: "If

I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you, for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord."—I. Cor. ix., 2.

Asbury was not the first Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Thomas Coke preceded him by a few months. But Bishop Coke served only as a connecting link between Wesley and Methodist Episcopacy. The apostolicity of the succession starts with John Wesley. If Methodism has any apostolic succession by ordination it comes to her through the Presbyterial *order*. If this is invalid she falls back upon her Pentecostal succession received directly from the "Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus."

Asbury was a many-sided man and his work multiform and practical.

There is scarcely a popular agency to-day in the Church that did not come into existence under his creative superintendency. Agencies now esteemed of great value, and whose origin is ascribed to a later date, can easily be traced to his paternity. Let us note a few.

Asbury, the Father of our Educational System.

Though not scholastically trained himself, Asbury and Coke were both early and earnest founders of schools. No contemporaneous denomination or subsequent Church has done more for education than Asbury and his coadjutors, especially will this be conceded when the small number and poverty of Primitive Methodists are taken into account. The two colleges, one at Abingdon, Md., and the other in the centre of Baltimore, sprang into existence at their bidding as early as 1785. Asbury records in his journal how in that year he rode to Abingdon to preach the foundation sermon of Cokesbury College. The name was a compound of Coke and Asbury. The building was situated about twenty-five miles from Baltimore, on elevated ground containing four acres and overlooking the Chesapeake Bay and Susquehanna River at their confluence. From every point on the summit there was a picturesque view stretching away in the distance by sea and land for twenty or fifty miles. Balti-

more ought to redeem the old site and rebuild the Cokesbury College auxiliary to Bishop Hurst's *American University.*

Both Asbury and Coke acted as agents to collect money for these institutions. Both attended the commencements. Dr. Coke thoroughly examined the classes, and both bishops commended the students' addresses, and rewarded the proficiency of some by a souvenir of a dollar each. Upwards of seventy students were reported as residents in the institution as early as 1792.

A stringent code of laws and regulations was drafted for the government of the school, and a record was kept of the conversions occurring and the religious character of the pupils. Daily prayer with the students was enjoined. It was expected to be a converting agency as well as a seat of learning and culture for the infant Church in its rapidly increasing membership, which up to this date was destitute of educational opportunities.

Dr. Coke writes: "In erecting this college, our object is not to raise Gospel ministers, but to serve our pious friends and our married preachers in the proper education of their sons." "In this college," says Samuel Drew, the biographer of Dr. Coke, "the principal aim was to unite these two great ornaments of human nature, *genuine religion and extensive learning.*"

Nor was this rustic institution miscalled a college. It was furnished with library and philosophic apparatus and a corps of classic professors. Dr. Hall was the President, an accomplished man, ripe scholar, and gifted lecturer. Bishop Coke writes of him: "He is both the scholar, the philosopher, and the gentleman. He *truly fears God* and pays a most exact and delicate attention to all the rules of the institution." He speaks well also of the classic tutor and mathematical professor. Such was the incipiency of the educational work in Methodism which now equals that of any other Church, and yet seems to be only the slightly opening bud of a magnificent flower. These facts ought to correct some misapprehensions. One is that Methodists were indifferent to

education until recent years. Such, I believe, has been the general impression outside of our own denomination, and we have helped to strengthen that impression by dating our college interests no farther back, in common discourse, than the founding of Augusta College in Kentucky and the founding of the Wesleyan University in Connecticut. This gives to our zeal for learning a very modern birth, for Augusta College was founded in 1825 and the Wesleyan University in 1831, while Yale College, a Congregational school, was established in 1717 and Harvard in 1636.

These comparisons place Methodism at a disadvantage. She seems as a factor in education to be a creature of but yesterday, whereas according to veritable history she has been an educational force from the beginning, having two colleges and numerous academic institutions. Both of these colleges were utterly destroyed by fire. When this catastrophe occurred Bishop Asbury received it as an indication that it was not the will of God that he should turn aside now to build expensive colleges, and he declared he would not. Bishop Coke, though hesitating at first, finally came to the same conclusion. This determination of Asbury has been ungenerously misconstrued. He has been represented as abandoning education because these colleges were burnt—discouraged and petulant like Jonah when the worm and east wind destroyed the gourd over his head.

Not so. The history tells us they only came to the conclusion that it was not the will of God that they should engage in building up institutions so *expensive*. Accordingly they contented themselves for years with less pretentious schools. But an unbroken line of educational pursuits in Methodism extends back to at least 1785.

Nor were these institutions mere elementary schools, but institutions of classic grade and regularly equipped as such.

How then did it come to pass that the Methodist ministry had been reputed an unlearned and even ignorant ministry? First—Because the first recruits of Methodist preachers were not generally educated, nor could they be. Mr. Wesley, from the time he permitted Maxfield to preach in deference

to his own mother, contrary to his own churchly prejudices, continued to employ lay preachers. Second—When the colonies achieved their freedom and became independent States, missionaries ceased to be sent from England. Mr. Wesley himself threw American Methodism off on its own resources. Asbury therefore was driven to utilize native talent. But the demand for preachers was so great, and the work so vast and rapidly increasing, that it became utterly impossible to supply the pulpits with college-bred men. Consequently uncultured and even ignorant men who developed great moral power and usefulness, had to be and wisely were utilized as preachers. And to this class of men more than any other, Methodism owes its prodigious growth. Third—It must be confessed there has ever existed in the Church a repugnance to *school-made preachers*. Methodism has from its beginning believed in a direct and authoritative call of God to preach, and that without such a call no man has any business in the sacred office. At this point the M. E. Church diverges from sister denominations. In other churches young men are considered at liberty to call and qualify themselves for the office of the ministry, just as they may choose law or medicine, and educate themselves accordingly. Of course this peculiar belief of Methodists has caused them to place a higher estimate upon divine and spiritual endowments than upon any scholastic training.

But from the beginning Methodism has prized and fostered education, and no Church can count among its founders a larger or more brilliant galaxy of learned men.

The moral discipline of Cokesbury College was superior to that of any university now extant. Had I space I would transcribe the code of twenty-nine articles adopted for its government. The want of such moral and religious government has made the universities of the world, with few exceptions, as much a bane as a blessing.

Asbury a Missionary Advocate.

Bishop Asbury was not decorated with the honorable title of "*Missionary Secretary*," but actually he was a collector

and administrator of missionary money. He travelled far as a missionary himself, but there were destitute regions in the South, West, and North, which neither he nor his regular itinerants could reach. To supply these places he raised a missionary fund. As early as 1786, he writes in his journal, being in Baltimore: "I preached three times on Sunday and made a collection to defray the expenses of sending missionaries to the western settlements. I spoke twice on the same subject through the course of the week." There were five missionary discourses within a week, and it is not to be presumed the effort was temporary, for the wants of the western settlements were perpetual and increasing. At the same time three missionaries were sent to Nova Scotia—William Black and two other men by the name of Mann. To support these missions Bishop Coke, co-operating with Asbury, raised in Baltimore in one afternoon $150. In Philadelphia and New York they raised the magnificent sum, for those times, of £60, about $300. It is not just, therefore, to early Methodism, nor historically true, if we ignore these magnificent missionary endeavors of 1786 under Asbury, and date the origin of our missionary enterprises as late as 1816, and ascribe its beginning to the preaching of Lindsay, at Marietta, O., and the conversion of the colored man, John Stewart, an inebriate, who in a sort of visionary ecstasy set off for the northern wilderness and finally came upon the Delaware and Wyandot Indians and preached to them, and conversions followed. These were very thrilling incidents and no doubt had the effect to re-create the missionary spirit in the Church, and led to the organization of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, April 5, 1819.

But the real missionary movement in the Church dates back to Asbury's time in 1786, two years after the organization of the Church. Then, as now, the preachers collected what they called "*mites*" and brought their reports to Conference. Here we find the germ of the million and a half *mite* which is the glory of the Church to-day. What hath God wrought!

Asbury as an Instructor of Children.

We would not vainly claim, as some have done, that Methodism first started Sunday-schools, for neither Asbury nor Robert Raikes ever instituted Sunday-schools proper, but Asbury did meet and teach the children. He prepared a little book and trained them catechetically. The early Methodist preachers treated children not only as catechumen, but as a part of their pastoral fold.

Last Days and Death of Asbury.

Francis Asbury served the Church in America forty-five years. Thirty-two years he filled the office of General Superintendent or Bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Beginning his missionary work in 1771, he prosecuted his evangelistic labors through the Revolutionary war. He was a non-juror, and when his unswerving fidelity and truth as a simple preacher of the Gospel became known, the greatest and best men in the land honored and protected him. Washington was his friend. That great man extended his hospitalities to him and to Bishop Coke, and heard with respect and sympathy their anti-slavery sentiments. Judge White and Governor Barratt of Delaware, and Governor Worthington of Ohio, were his personal friends, and yet he was the plainest of men. Though an Englishman, and loyally acknowledging allegiance to the King, he was kindly disposed to the Colonies, and when they obtained their independence and Washington was elected President, he was first among the ministers of the various churches to congratulate him. Bishop Coke and Asbury united in signifying to Washington their desire to present themselves to his Excellency as representatives of the young but growing Methodist Episcopal Church. Washington named an hour to receive them, and responded with great cordiality and respect in a written reply.

In 1812 the venerable and toil-worn apostle to the Colonies and infant States came to the General Conference in New York City, which proved to be the last General Conference his anxious eyes ever looked upon. He had served

the Church and country forty years, travelling on an average six thousand miles a year, extending his evangelistic ministries every twelve months, from the icy regions of Maine and the Canadas to the sultry savannahs of Georgia and South Carolina; and from the Atlantic to the extreme western boundaries of Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee. He travelled on horseback until he became too feeble to endure that mode of transportation. Then he substituted a light wagon. His appointments were made in advance, he moved incessantly, usually preaching every day. He invariably met the Societies after preaching, inquiring into the spiritual condition of each one. Herein lies the secret of the great prosperity of Methodism in the earlier periods of its history. The ministers were class-leaders no less than preachers. At this, his last General Conference, it became evident that Asbury was permanently breaking. The almond tree flourished, and those that look out of the window are darkened.

He did not read the Episcopal Address. He makes this entry in his journal: "My eyes fail. I will resign the stations to Bishop McKendree. Whether health, life, or death, good is the will of the Lord. I will trust Him, yea, I will praise Him; He is the strength of my heart and my portion forever. My mind enjoys great peace and Divine consolation."

This must have been a delightful going down of the sun of life in his case. How grateful the retrospect to his feelings. When he stepped from the ship to the shore at Philadelphia there were only six hundred Methodists in America. In the Episcopal address at the General Conference of 1812, we find this computation: "At present we have about one hundred and ninety thousand members; upwards of two thousand local, and about seven hundred travelling, preachers in our own connection, and these widely scattered over seventeen States, besides the Canadas and several of the territorial settlements."

As this enumeration was made four years before Asbury died, and as converts and accessions to Methodism were numbered by many thousands every year in those revival days, it must be that when Asbury transferred the care

of the Church and the cure of souls to other hands four years later, he must have left wellnigh or quite a quarter of a million members in the Methodist fold.

It must not be concluded, however, that Asbury, on account of declining strength, relaxed his efforts and took the remaining four years of his life to gather up his feet to die. The severest labor of his life was done in the subsequent quadrennial.

About this time he records: "In eight months I have journeyed six thousand miles, met nine conferences, and attended ten camp meetings." Add to this daily preaching, meeting the Societies, stationing the preachers at each conference, personal and official correspondence, and the care of all the churches, and we have an account of fatiguing toil almost incredible. In the vigor of earlier years, he had penetrated through desolate wildernesses infested by savage Indians, taken his turn as sentinel, slept on the ground, endured heat, and cold, and storms, prostrate ever and anon with malarial fevers, and living on the coarsest fare—an episcopal rustic.

But now the end approaches. He can no longer travel alone. Wesley Bond, a faithful companion, attends him. The feet of the aged pilgrim were halting to the grave. He was too feeble to get in and out of the carriage without assistance.

He doubtless felt somewhat as Charles Wesley did when in a similar condition he wrote the following lines concerning himself:

> "In age and feebleness extreme,
> Who shall a sinful worm redeem?
> Jesus, my only hope Thou art,
> Strength of my failing flesh and heart;
> O, could I catch a smile from Thee,
> And drop into eternity."

He was on his way from the West and South to Baltimore, where he hoped to meet the General Conference, May 1, 1816. Only a month intervened. He came to Richmond, where he was advertised to preach. Arriving at the church he was too feeble to enter it. Some friends, observ-

ing his weakness, endeavored to dissuade him from attempting to preach. He insisted, saying, "I must once more give my testimony in this place." They carried him into the church and placed him on a table which had been prepared. There he sat and preached nearly an hour, pausing occasionally to recover breath and strength. At the close he was borne from the weeping congregation to his lodgings.

The next morning he continued his journey. He rode about twenty miles, reaching the home of his friend, George Arnold, in a place called Spottsylvania. Here he became so exhausted that he could not proceed. He was lifted out of his carriage and borne into the house, and placed on a bed to die. A day or two and Sabbath came. He spoke of having worship, seeming to say:

> "Walk with me through the dreadful shade;
> And certified that Thou art mine,
> My spirit calm and undismayed,
> I shall into Thy hands resign.
> Long as my God shall lend me breath,
> My every pulse shall beat for Him."

His travelling companion read and expounded the twenty first chapter of Revelation. Asbury was calm and devout. At the close his companion discovered he was beginning to sink in his chair. He at once supported his head in his arms—a moment longer and he ceased to breathe. Thus lived and died Francis Asbury, a good man, a distinguished benefactor of the united Colonies and infant States of America, and the chief founder of a large Church. He died March 29, 1816.

The General Conference met in Baltimore a month later, and ordered his remains brought to that city, where a vault had been prepared. It was done during the session, and the whole Conference attended the funeral ceremony, forming a long and mournful procession to his tomb. There lies the dust of the apostolic man, awaiting the first resurrection at the coming of Christ.

NOTE.—The authorities for the foregoing paper are Asbury's *Journal*, Wesley's *Journal*, Strickland's *Life of Bishop Asbury*, Samuel Drew's *Life of Bishop Thomas Coke*, and the histories of the M. E. Church by Stevens and by Bangs.

II.

BENJAMIN SCHMOLCK

BENJAMIN SCHMOLCK,[1]

Author of "My Jesus, as Thou Wilt!"

A MONOGRAPH.

By JEREMIAH EAMES RANKIN, D.D., LL.D.,

President of Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Benjamin Schmolck, the author of the favorite hymn "My Jesus, as thou wilt!", was born in Brauchitsdorf, Silesia, December 21, 1672. It is registered in the Calendar as St. Thomas' Day, and Schmolck says that it often led him, in the troubles of his spirit, to think of the wounded side and the bleeding nail-prints of his Saviour. He was contemporary with a kindred spirit and lyric poet, John Anastasius Freilinghausen, born the same month, though two years later, and dying two years earlier, and on the same day of the month with himself. His father, Martin Schmolck, was for twelve years associate-pastor at Schniedsberg, where he wedded Rosina Dehmel, daughter of Martin Dehmel. In 1665, the senior Schmolck was made pastor of Brauchitsdorf, Liegnitz, a village of some eight hundred inhabitants, where he remained forty-seven years; a man fatherly, faithful, and indefatigable in his office. Benjamin, the hymn-writer, was his fourth child; and him the father solemnly dedicated to the work of the Christian ministry, baptising him on the fourth day after his birth.

Benjamin was bright and talented, though never, as is

[1] This paper is derived from a life of the distinguished hymn-writer, by Ludwig Grote, Leipzig, 1860. It is partly a translation and partly a condensation. The poet wrote his name without the final "e," although in Knapp's great collection it is spelled differently (Schmolke).

often true in such cases, wayward or prodigal. His mother died on September 4, 1676, when he was four years old, and this made him still more, as his name indicated, the son of his father's heart. Fortunately for little Benjamin, he was received as a pupil, with the Von Rothenkirschen children, of the genuine and conscientious tutor, Peter Paul Wiesner. Between the pupil and this teacher there sprang up an intimacy, which was not interrupted when Wiesner was transferred to Schniedsberg, the birthplace of Benjamin's mother. The pupil followed his teacher, and resided with a widow, who took him under her motherly care.

At nine years of age, so talented was he, and so rapid had been his progress, that Benjamin entered the public schools at Steinau, on the Oder. The associate teacher, John George Schubart, gave him free board and lodging, and took special charge of his instruction. Three years later, Benjamin went to the Gymnasium at Liegnitz, where, under Ephraim Heermann and George Maywald, he continued his studies. At fifteen, he determined to remove from Liegnitz to Breslau, where he hoped to find better facilities for fitting himself for the University. Barely had he reached Breslau, when he resolved to go with other youth of the place to Lauban, where was a distinguished schoolmaster and minister, George Wende. There he pursued his further studies with the greatest enthusiasm and success.

It was not long before wealthy patrons in Lauban took him into their dwelling and gave him free support, he meantime also giving instruction to others. After remaining five years in Lauban, he graduated, (ready to repair to the University at Leipzig,) delivering an oration on "The Use of Pagan Books by Christians."

Between Lauban and Leipzig, he found time to spend a few days at home. The twelve years of his absence had not corrupted him. He had kept his child-like faith. He went into his father's pulpit, and there gave such a simple testimony to God's goodness, and preached with such favor, that his father's patron, Nicolaus Heinrich von Haugwitz, granted him a stipend of three hundred thalers for three

years ; and later, on the same visit, as he was discoursing on the text, "But I am poor and needy, yet the Lord thinketh upon me," a relative of Herr von Haugwitz, who was in the congregation, was so much moved that he added considerably to the above stipend. Thus he was enabled to pass his student-life free from anxiety, and to give himself wholly to his studies.

On September 28, 1693, Schmolck reached the University of Leipzig, first giving his special attention for a time, as was then the custom, to secular science, though theology was his ultimate aim. Hardly had he taken his first draught from this fountain when he was completely fascinated ; and for the moment he would gladly have abandoned theology for the study of medicine. A fellow-countryman seven years his junior, Christian Wolf by name, had entered the University at Jena, preached a few times, when he was seized with such fondness for mathematics that he finally turned his attention exclusively to natural philosophy, and became very distinguished as a defender of the truth in that department. But Schmolck who, up to this time, had pursued a quiet and even tenor of life, met with the temptation to turn aside from the ministry in such an earnest and devout spirit, that he only became more firmly established in the sacred purpose of his life. To this decision he was helped not a little by his father, who had recorded a vow in heaven as to his profession, and by the memory of his mother, who was the witness there of its reality.

Once decided, he gave himself with great assiduity to such lecturers as Günther, Pritius, Seligmann, Olearus, Rothe, and Schmidte ; and he never again wavered, as to duty or inclination. Twice during his University course was he overtaken by sickness, and in his third year the attack was so serious and severe, that he never during his life entirely recovered from its results. His temporary losses in study, however, he soon made up ; for his talents were of brilliant order.

At this period of his life, that gift for which he was especially endowed began to display itself. He was to

become second only to Paul Gerhardt as a hymn-writer for that nation, whose hymns, next to the inspired ones of the Hebrews, are the noblest in all literature. At Lauban, indeed, this talent of Schmolck's had not been entirely hid. For George Wende himself and his associate Gottfried Hoffman, like so many other Germans, were both composers of hymns. And their example could not be lost upon such a mind as Schmolck's. At any rate, during his University course, Schmolck's talents were in such demand for occasional hymns, that it became a source of revenue to him; and by it he was able to add a year to his anticipated term at Leipzig.

Four years of University life, and then Schmolck was called back to Brauchitsdorf, his native place. His father was seventy years old. There, under his father's eye, he could practice and perfect his powers as a preacher. And four years later, on January 2, 1701, he was appointed to be his father's associate; and having been ordained at Leignitz, he entered with great delight upon his duties. On February 12, 1702, he married Anna Rosine Rehwald, a daughter of Christopher Rehwald of Lauban. This early and auspicious entrance upon the sacred office, his union with the wife of his choice, the prospect of becoming his father's successor, and especially the privilege of sweetening and lightening his father's professional labors; these all combined to make his lot an enviable one, and to fill his heart with joy.

Thus established as his father's associate, it for the moment seemed that Schmolck had reached the very sphere for which he was especially fitted; where he could comfort and help his venerable father, watch over the flock his father had loved, and cultivate the sacred gift of hymn-writing, with which he had been so richly endowed. He was chosen his father's associate, January 2, 1701; and on the 12th of December, 1702, when in his thirtieth year, he was elected one of the three pastors of the Protestant Church in Schweidnitz. It was a great trial to think of leaving his father and his father's work. And there were very many anxieties

naturally awakened as to the new field of labor. To show what was required of him, we must glance a moment at the history of Protestantism in Silesia. The Reformation was early inaugurated there, and had spread with great rapidity. Ferdinand I. had established his evangelical subjects in Bohemia, Silesia, Moravia, and Lausitz in all their ecclesiastical rights and immunities. His action had been confirmed by Maximilian II. when he was crowned at Breslau, in 1563. But under the weak and weak-minded Rudolph II., their enemies began the work of undermining and exterminating the Reformed Churches. The Silesians had paid 300,000 gulden to secure the guarantee of their ecclesiastical rights. And this patent, Matthias, who had supplanted his brother Rudolph upon the throne of Bohemia, solemnly confirmed. As the successor of Matthias, Ferdinand II., who, by the battle of White Mountain, had won back the throne of Bohemia, entered into compact with the Silesian Diet to grant the citizens full liberty of faith and of conscience. This agreement he utterly failed to fulfill. In 1629 was issued the Restitution Edict, by which this Emperor attempted to repeal the Reformation. Count Drohna, who boasted that he had converted more people without preaching than Peter on the day of Pentecost—this notorious opposition leader left no stone unturned to dragoon the people back into allegiance to the old faith. He took away their houses of worship, expelled the ministers and put his own creatures in their places; marched the citizens to churches they had conscientiously left before the bayonet. The city of Schweidnitz was especially selected as the sphere of his operations. In spite of them all, however, in 1636, this city numbered only sixteen heads of families in sympathy with his efforts, while in other parts of Silesia the Lutherans held fast to their Protestant confession.

When at last Gustavus Adolphus brought triumph to the cause of evangelical religion, and the Peace of Westphalia was declared, the Silesians received little recognition for their loyalty to the truth. The three cities of Schweidnitz, Jauer, and Glogau were permitted to have each one a

Lutheran Church without the city limits, on application to the Emperor, and in such locations as he should choose. Thus were they excluded from the general advantages of the peace, and deprived of all the rights they had enjoyed previous to the Thirty Years' War. An imperial commission was appointed to confiscate all the Church property acquired since the Reformation, and to exile all the ministers. During the period from 8th of December, 1653, to 23d of April, 1654, this treatment was perpetrated on 394 parishes in the principalities of Schweidnitz and Jauer. And not till the 23d of September, 1659, after repeated delays and petitions, did the representatives of the Emperor stake out a site for the new Lutheran Church in Schweidnitz. The people were forbidden to have steeples or chimes, and were forced to build their churches and parsonages of wood or clay; nor were they permitted a school for their children. The parish in Schweidnitz was allowed three associate pastors, to whom the people could go for confession and communion; but all baptisms, marriages, and funerals were to be performed by Roman Catholic officials; while all pastoral functions were under the surveillance of the same.

For example, Pastor Krause, one of Schmolck's predecessors, who had served the Church since 1675, having said in a funeral sermon that neither wearing a monk's cowl, nor the invocation of the Virgin Mary was needful to salvation, he was indicted by the Father Rector of the Jesuit College, and was sentenced to pay the complainant the sum of one hundred ducats; while Pastor Wiedmann, Schmolck's immediate predecessor, for publishing a book when he was a student, twelve years afterward was seized and imprisoned, and barely escaped the pillory through the intervention of Count Stollberg of Wernigerode, whose wife had been a former pupil of the man accused, and who had made him court-preacher and chief-pastor to Wernigerode.

To such a field at such a time this peaceful, poetic spirit was called. His parish at this time comprising nearly the whole principality, namely, the districts of Schwiednitz, Bolkenhain, Landshut, Waldenburg, and Reichenbach. The

amount of work required of the three associate pastors may be inferred from the fact that the year Schmolck entered upon his duties, there were 1000 baptisms, and the next year, 1727. The following were the regular official duties, which the three pastors had to divide among themselves: On Sundays and holidays there were three sermons, one early in the morning, a principal sermon, and an afternoon sermon; beside a vesper service and the instruction of children. In the week also there were two sermons and daily prayers, and the explanation of the Bible. Finally, each minister had to sit twice a week for the confessions of the people, beside fulfilling all other special calls, such as funerals, marriages, visits to the sick, and communion services with them.

Not deterred by the experiences of his predecessors, and the known burdens before him, Schmolck entered cheerfully upon his labors, and the Lord fulfilled to him that saying of King Solomon's: "When a man's ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him." His prudence and wisdom, his foresight and forethought, his peaceful temper toward his colleagues, his gentleness and friendliness to all, his earnest sermons and his real care for souls, made his enemies dumb before him. And without abating from the truth as Protestants received it, even Roman Catholics, who had persecuted his predecessors, had no complaints to make.

In May, 1704, two years after going to Schweidnitz, Schmolck publicly appeared for the first time as a sacred poet. Under the pseudonym of Be Standigen, he issued a collection of fifty hymns. It was entitled *Holy Flames for the Heavenly Minded.* The *Latin Literary Gazette* of that year, printed in Hamburg, spoke of the collection as containing "very fine and graceful hymns, and not lacking poetical fire." In a short time the book had gone all over Germany. In 1705 appeared a second edition, and in 1706 a third; the former with fifty new hymns, and the latter with forty, making in all one hundred and forty. One edition followed another in quick succession. In 1717 the seventh

appeared, in 1732 the thirteenth. This was far beyond the poet's expectation. But poetical success did not turn him aside from his pastoral work. He employed only his leisure hours to refresh his mind and divert himself from the cares of the day. His sermons, meantime, gave him more and more influence with the Churches. In 1708, he was made archdeacon ; in 1712, senior-deacon ; and in 1714, pastor-primarius.

In the year 1708, or six years after Schmolck went to Schweidnitz, great relief came to the Evangelical Church there through Charles XII. of Sweden, who marched his conquering troops through Silesia, in pursuit of the King of Poland. The Silesians, in their distress, remembered what had been done by his ancestor, Gustavus Adolphus, and appealed to him for help. Convinced of the justice of their complaints, he effected an understanding for their relief with Joseph I., who had lately come to the imperial throne of Austria.

Among the concessions granted at the request of this young hero, were the following: The right to add six new churches ; to have steeples, and chimes, and public funerals ; the liberty to have schools of their own, and to employ as many ministers as their wants required. Three new associate pastors were appointed at Schweidnitz. Of these pastors, on account of the successive deaths of his first associates, who had succumbed to excessive labor, Schmolck was made pastor-primarius. His duties, beyond taking the general care of the whole flock and giving counsel to his associates, were to preach the more important discourses, one of two weekly sermons, and to solemnize all weddings and funerals. Besides this, he was superintendent of the lyceum and the newly established schools. To his interest in this latter department of work many of his best hymns, adapted to the wants of schools, bear conclusive testimony. In 1714 John Christian Günther, one of the most celebrated scholars of this period and a poet also, was appointed inspector of schools, and found in Schmolck a friend paternal and beneficent, addressing to him from Wittemberg

complimentary lines, in which he speaks of himself as the poetical child of the Schweidnitz pastor.

In 1704 there was born to the poet a daughter, baptised as Joanna Rosine; on June 4, 1708, was baptised a son, Benjamin Gottlob; August 8, 1710, a daughter, Eleonora Sophia; the 27th of December, 1711, a son, Immanuel Benjamin, and the 29th of April, 1712, a daughter, Agnes Eleonora. About this time two daughters were successively taken away by death, and with the last one, during a single year, three children of his colleagues. As the children were playmates, these deep afflictions very much affected him, and he wrote memorial hymns personating his two surviving sons, and putting their sense of loss into his verse. These hymns show to us the tenderness of Schmolck's heart, and how readily he took upon him the sorrows even of the little ones of his flock.

In 1712 his venerable father died, having resigned his pastoral office a few years previous. At the age of 82 this faithful man had preached a farewell sermon to his flock of 46 years. The event profoundly moved the poet-son. He gave expression to his feelings in a hymn, which commemorates alike the fidelity of pastor and people. Meantime, what time he is afflicted, God gives him songs in the night. The same year he published a volume containing 112 hymns, 89 of which refer to Sundays and the other holy days of the Church. This edition was so rapidly exhausted that in 1714 a new one was called for, which call was twice repeated. He wrote diligently and with reference to making spiritual impressions, many of his productions being set to music.

How Schmolck's heart turned to his former friends is shown by his dedicating a new volume in 1715 to two "most honored ladies," the countesses, Anne Elizabeth von Hochberg, and Agnete Helen von Hochberg, who had been his sponsors at baptism. This volume contained prayers as well as hymns. Of these prayers he says, in the preface: "These are my home devotions. Those who are willing to pray with me, may here know what I speak with GOD."

For three successive years new editions of this book were called for, and, in 1729, the eighth appeared. A volume, mostly of new poems, was issued at Bresslau and Liegnitz in 1716, dedicated to his godmothers, Barbara Agnes Haase and Eva von Neisemeuschel, both by birth Von Bocks. The dedication began as follows: "Gracious ladies, you are still remaining, of those, who, at my baptism, laid me on the heart of God. How I rejoice that you have been permitted to live so long to pray for me. As you answered for me, when I was speechless, so will I speak to God for you, so long as I have breath. As you held me up in your hands, so would I in the hands of faith present you still to God."

That year occurred the terrible fire, which laid half of Schweidnitz in ashes. He wrote a hymn upon the calamity, which the firemen of the town were accustomed to sing on the anniversary. He had now become so popular a hymn-writer that pirated editions of his poems were several times put forth. The publishers of a collection of prayers and hymns in 1731, complained of "the unconscientious and counterfeit" edition, which some person had issued. Three new collections were made in 1720. In one of these he lays out large plans for future composition, such as epistolic hymns and hymns on the passion of the Saviour. The second of the two, published in 1720, is dedicated to "the most noble and most learned" Herr Paul Pater, a famous mathematician of the city of Dantzig. And as it had been said of many of his hymns, that they are too long for church use, he purposely made them shorter. New editions of this book appeared in 1725, 1727, and 1737.

Schmolck now received commendation from all directions; from theologians, composers, friends. Eminent preachers and laymen selected hymns from his collections, to be used at their funerals; as, for instance, John Paul Büttner, of Weisenfels, wrote one of his hymns for the dying in his Bible, recited it in the church the last time he preached, and had it sung at his grave. Also the celebrated historian and physician of Nuremberg, Dr. Gottfried Thomasino, was once pres-

ent with his daughter at the evening devotions of Hoenische Home, and requested her to recite from memory Schmolck's "Evening Benediction." From that moment everybody in Coburg, high and low, became his ardent admirer. People called him the Silesian Rist, the Silesian Opitz, a second Paul Gerhardt. The larger hymn-books at once embraced his productions; those of Altenburg, Coburg, Colditz, Dresden, Eisenach, Gotha, Hildburgkausen, and others. The Hanover hymn-book has not less than 53. As early as 1718, too, the leaders of secular literature turned their attention to him. Professor Gottlieb Stolle, of Jena, one of the most celebrated *literati* of his time, counted him the first of German hymn-writers, and so, in 1730, honored as a preacher and pastor at home, celebrated as a poet abroad, and assured of recognition in his nation's literature, Schmolck reached his 58th birthday.

Then began his breaking up. His ancestors had mostly lived to between 70 and 80; his father had died at 82. Schmolck was stout in figure and of robust appearance. He had often said of his forefathers: "If I do not attain to their years, I shall the sooner be in their company." No sudden death, however, was to be his lot. It was on the *Sunday Lætare* of the year 1730, as he was sitting in his room, that he had a stroke of paralysis. His friends, and especially his son-in-law, Dr. John Gottlieb Bauer, who had married his oldest daughter in 1725, made every effort for his restoration. His congregation, too, united in daily prayers for his recovery. As summer drew near, the sufferer was able to repair to Charlottenbrunnen, where he met with the greatest sympathy. The baths, too, were beneficial, although his right side remained still paralyzed. His strength was so improved that, when he returned home, he again entered the pulpit, and for five years more, his spirit still strong, his will unbroken, he demonstrated by his patience and firmness that it was not all poetry which he had put into his sermons and his hymns. Without complaining, he allowed the Divine Smelter to purify him of his dross. His literary activity was unchecked. For the

next five years he issued a new volume each year, the last bearing the title, *Roses After Thorns.* Many of these poems were written by dictation. "This," says he, in a volume published in 1734, "has ever been my pastime in my sickness. It will be very plain to my readers that not only my body, but my mind, too, is weak. I cannot be too thankful to God that He makes things so tolerable to me. His strength is still made perfect in weakness. Now that I cannot bring large stones for the building of His temple, I may bring little grains of sand."

At last, the stroke of paralysis having been twice repeated, he lost his sight and mental activity, and could no longer preach. Still he let others lead him where he could hear the confessions of his people, and bless them with the laying on of his hands. Finally he was entirely bedridden, lost his memory, and could scarcely articulate; but his heart was not dead; his soul waited on God. He managed not only to bear his own sufferings, but minister to others. He recited and sang hymns for the comfort of those who gathered, from time to time, around his bedside.

In the beginning of the year 1737 appeared symptoms of his immediate release from earth. Desiring to give his dearest ones a parting benediction, he gathered them around his bedside on February 12th. Like the patriarch of old, putting his hands on them, one by one, he could only thus signify his last emotions. That very day, before one o'clock at night (it was the anniversary of his marriage), he was called by God's angel Death to the marriage-supper of the Lamb. On the 17th of February he was buried in the cemetery of Trinity Church. Thousands of Christians came from far and near to do him last honors, and to mingle their tears and gratitude over his dust. In the learned world, too, his death had due mention. Professor Stolle, of Jena, paid him a beautiful tribute of praise. His portrait was hung in the sacristy of Trinity Church, and his memory has been held sacred in Schweidnitz, generation after generation. Amiable in personal appearance, Schmolck took possession of the stranger's favor at once. His talents were unusual;

his recognition during his life-time almost universal, but he never lost his humility. On the heart of Jesus he learned the art of being lowly. As he himself says: "I praise the grace of God, and give Him alone the honor, that my simple hymns have been introduced among the productions of the most revered poets, in the richest collections." Severe in his criticism of his own literary work, he was better able to endure unjust strictures from others; and knowing that his purpose was to glorify God and minister to the souls of men, he could write: "If I have written anything, by which God and pious souls can be served, I will rejoice. Nor will I trouble myself if people criticise my work."

Schmolck was as calm and patient a sufferer, as he was meek and heroic as a true soldier of the faith. He was a pronounced Lutheran, and believed thoroughly in the great doctrines of grace. In tribulation his faith never failed him. "Where am I, then, in my sorrow?" he inquires. "A rose which blooms among thorns." Having in himself all the best qualities of the pietistic school, he was free from their mistakes and excesses. He held as firmly to pure doctrine as to a pure Christian life.

As to the estimate held of him as a hymnologist in his own Germany, certain facts will indicate something. In Albert Knapp's cyclopædia of 3066 German hymns, written by 511 different authors, where Spitta has 55, and C. G. Barth 50, and Paul Gerhardt 70, Benjamin Schmolck has 83. Inferior usually to Gerhardt's in elevation and classical finish, they are always fresh, often beautiful, and sometimes brilliant.

The hymn for which he is best known in America, as we use it, "My Jesus as Thou wilt!" is partly a translation and partly a condensation. In the original the hymn has eleven stanzas, Miss Borthwick's rendering into English gives seven. The hymn, as it appears in English, is perhaps an improvement upon the original, though in the first quatrain of each verse it does not retain the double ending of the alternate lines. So far as a foreigner can judge, Schmolck divides the honor of being the best German hymn-writer with Paul

Gerhardt; at any rate stands next to him, Gerhardt being the writer of the educated, and Schmolck of the common people; though it is to be said that some of Gerhardt's best contributions to German hymnology were themselves derived from Latin sources. For example, of the 12 samples given in Schaff's *Library of Religious Poetry*, 3 are different versions of his own translations of Bernard of Clairvaux; while of 120 hymns in his entire collection of hymns, 27 are versions of Psalms, 24 are from other passages of Scripture, 7 from the Latin of Bernard, and 6 from prayers in John Arndt's *Paradiesgärtlein.* This, of course, may be to the praise of his genius, for he touches nothing which he does not adorn. Schmolck's more than 1000 hymns sprang out of his personal life, were too abundant to be always superior, but many of them are full of beautiful similes and allusions derived from the Bible, and sweet to the believer's heart; and never will they cease to influence the Christian experience of his native land, and, in some degree, of the whole world.

III

THE LIFE AND WORK OF S. THOMAS AQUINAS

THE LIFE AND WORK OF S. THOMAS AQUINAS.

By Rev. THOMAS O'GORMAN, D.D.,

Professor of Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

This paper deals with the history of the life and works of S. Thomas Aquinas.

The Literature of the Subject is very extensive.

All general works treating of the history of the Church, of dogma, Christian literature, and especially philosophy, have much to say of S. Thomas. Of the latter class, history of philosophy, I would name as giving particular attention to the Angelical Doctor, Ueberweg, Stöckl, Hauréau.

But besides those more general accounts we have many monographs, ancient and modern, on S. Thomas. Immediately after his death Etienne de Salanache and Ptolemæus Lucensis published a biography of the saint in their annals. However, the first complete and detailed biography of his life is that of Gulielmus de Thoco, a fellow-religious of the Dominican Order, who had known S. Thomas in life, and had much to do with the process of his canonization. This biography and the acts of the process became the main sources of biographies by the following authors: Bernard Guido, Peter de Natalibus, James de Susata, S. Antoninus of Florence, Claude de Rota, John Garzonias, John Antony Flaminius Forocornetensis, Lawrence Surius, and two unknown writers in the fourteenth century, one of whom is

author of the *Acta S. Thomæ*, the other of a work attributed to James de Voragine, but evidently not from him, for the biography in question treats of the Canonization, and De Voragine was dead 1298, before the process of canonization, which was begun only 1320. A life of S. Thomas was added to the complete edition of his works published in Rome, 1570, by order of Pius V. Then followed a period when little was written about the Great Doctor, but in the last century interest in him was revived, and a number of lives were published: Touron, *Vie de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, Paris, 1737; Wielmius, *De Doctrina et Scriptis S. Thomas Aquin*, Venet, 1750; Feigerle, *Vitæ Thomæ a Villanova, Thomæ Aquin*, Vienna, 1837; Delecluze, *Gregoire VII., François d'Assise and Thomas d'Aquin*, Paris, 1844; Bareille, *Histoire de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, Louvain, 1846; Harry Hörtel, *Thomas Von Aquino u. seine Zeit*, Augsburg, 1846; Charles Jourdain, *Philosophie de S. Thomas d'Aquin*, 2 vols. in 8vo., Paris, 1858, crowned by the Academy of Moral Sciences; Hampden, *Life of Thomas Aquinas*, London, 1848; Werner, *Der Heilege Thomas V. Aquin*, Regensburg, 3 vols.; J. Delitsch, *Thomas V. Aquino kritisch Dargestelt*, Leipzig, 1870; Vaughan, *Life and Labors of S. Thomas Aquinas*, London, 1871, 2 vols.; Cicognani, *Sulla Vita de San Tomasso*, 1874; translation of the same, *Life of S. Thomas*, London, 1882; *Albert LeGrand and S. Thomas*, Paris, 1880.

I omit the numerous books, pamphlets, magazine articles, written since the famous Encyclical of Leo XIII., August, 1879, on the revival of Thomistic philosophy in Catholic schools. That act of the Sovereign Pontiff produced a flood of literature, dealing not so much with the life of S. Thomas as with his method and system, the rise and decadence of his philosophy and its bearings on present scientific systems and methods. They have, therefore, not to do with the specific purpose of this paper, which is to give the main facts in the life of the Great Doctor. I will keep, in this paper, to the earliest biography, that of Gulielmus de Thoco, and to the acts of the process of canonization, as being the

contemporary and most reliable sources. They are both to be found in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, March 7.[1]

Life of S. Thomas.

In the year 1226 S. Thomas was born at Rocca Secca, a castle belonging to the family in the kingdom of Naples. The name of the family was Aquinas, or, in Italian, Aquino. His father was Landulphus, Count of Aquino, and Lord of Loretto and Belcastro. His grandfather, Thomas Aquinas, had married Francesca, sister of the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa. His mother was of a family of Norman princes. Of the ancient stronghold where Thomas was born there is nothing to be seen now but ruins that look like a part of the rugged rock on which it stood. Only the earliest years of his childhood were spent in the home of his parents, for at the age of five he was put to school in the monastery of Monte Cassino. This abbey—with the power and wealth of a kingdom dependent on it, built against the mountain-side, and looking down on the fertile plain of Aquino—could be considered an antiquity even in the days of S. Thomas. Six centuries before his time, S. Benedict had laid its foundations, where the impure worship of lascivious divinities had held sway. Out of its cloisters had come the civilization of Europe, within its corridors sons of kings and men of arms, as well as sons of peasants and men of toil, had lived and slept in peace. The Aquinos had a family interest in the great monastery. Time and again they had risked fortunes and lives in its defence, and the very year Thomas was born Landulf Sinnebald, his maternal uncle, had been chosen its fifty-sixth abbot. To his care the boy was entrusted. In those days if education began early it lasted long and ended late, as we shall see presently.

There, away from the busy, noisy world, the child pupils

[1] For an account of the Bollandists and the authority of their work, see *A Religious Encyclopædia*, etc., editor, Philip Schaff; associate editors, Rev. Samuel M. Jackson, Rev. D. S. Schaff.

of S. Benedict breathed in knowledge and virtue. A pretty picture they make, grave and silent when stillness brooded over the house, making the arched cloisters ring with merry shout in time of play, mingling their shrill voices with the manlier tones of the bearded monks in the choir-stalls at Matins and Even-song, casting a childish innocence and freshness about the old, feudal abbey, as if typifying a life that is ever new, yet ever old. But more than a pretty picture, this was the nursery out of which came giants. Let me describe briefly the education imparted in those days. The school-room was the open cloister or the large chapter-hall, according to seasons. Each boy had his little portable box, in which he kept his books and writing, materials, and the box served him for a seat. The faculty was composed of the Archischolus, or principal, and his assistant teachers, and of the Proscholus, or master of discipline. The first task was to learn by heart from oral repetition certain portions of Scripture and the antiphons of the church offices with their music. Then came grammar, logic, and rhetoric, these were called the *trivium* course, afterwards came arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy, these were called the *Quadrivium* course. The two courses combined completed the education of every well-bred youth, whether intended for the clerical or any other profession. Upon this general foundation were built up afterwards the further studies special to each profession. The constant and deep reading of the Roman and Greek classics was the chief means by which the mind was trained and the faculties developed. Thus were bred the men who grappled with barbarism, preserved literature and science from wreck, founded the cities of Europe, drained the marshes, cleared the forests, turned the barren wastes into gardens, withstood the mailed hand of rude warriors in defence of woman, the serf, the poor, the orphan, of whatever was weak, lonely, and pitiable; in a word, created the civilization and Christendom of modern Europe. Rome's founders were suckled with strong milk; so were the founders of Christian Europe.

But the quiet of those years for young Thomas was about to be disturbed. It was a stormy period in the history of Europe, and the abbey was one of the storm-centres around which warred the conflicting elements, the Papacy and the Empire. It was taken by the Imperial troops, who turned it into a fortress. Monks and students were sent adrift. Thomas returned to his family; he was now twelve years old. You can well imagine the change from the cloister to the castle. The noise and excitement of the great house, horses and falcons and hounds, the tramp of armed men, the fluttering of banners, the neighing and champing of war-horses, the shrill blast of the trumpet, the free carousing, the songs of troubadours and minstrels; how different from the peace of the monastery, the demeanor of the black-robed monks, the chaunts of the sanctuary! Not long, however, did he have to tarry among such uncongenial surroundings, for his parents had resolved that he should continue his studies in Naples. The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, learned, sensual, generous, half Christian, half Mahommedan, had founded a university there, had gathered ten thousand students, had called to its chairs all the wit of the century from monastic Europe, Moorish Spain, and Saracenic Asia. The motley crowd made a wicked place of that city that Nature had made so beautiful. Immorality and learning jostled each other in its streets and halls. Young Thomas passed through the ordeal unstained by the immorality, enriched by the learning; so spotless his life, so brilliant his studies that his fame spread throughout the city, and became the common property and boast of the Neapolitans.

In the studies he had pursued so far—he was now seventeen years of age,—he had laid the foundation on which to build securely any professional avocation he might choose. The question of a profession now rose before him to be settled. Great minds that live above the transitory interests of earth and the inferior calls of selfishness, that observe the conditions of society about them and aspire to share in guiding the movements of the world to great results, make their

choice consciously and decidedly. Thomas must have been sensible of his powers, must have known the talent confided to him, must have felt the stirring of some great yearning, and, seeing what vast energies for good and evil were marshalling in the world about him toward some great conflict, must have asked himself the question, Am I to hide in the solitude of castle or of cloister, or am I to go down into the arena where the hosts are meeting? The arena of the conflict was the schools, and the struggle for mastery was between Christianity and philosophical rationalism—no age since has been so much like it as our own. He looked about for the organized power that was to carry Christianity to triumph through the conflict; truth no less than error, good no less than evil work through organisms. Monasticism, he saw, was waning—the old monasticism, I mean, of S. Benedict. It had been a great power, it had been called into existence for a great work. But to the Church alone are given the promises of indefectibility, she changes her weapons as the times demand. Monasticism was a weapon; she had used it for the conversion and civilization of the new Europe which succeeded to the Empire of Rome. And well had the work been done. Splendid cloisters, learned schools, precious libraries, literature, and science of the past rescued from oblivion and loss, stately ministers, a civilized people living in cultivated, fertile plains, marshes drained, forests cleared, cities grouped around the monasteries—in a word, Europe transformed physically and mentally and spiritually; such had been the work of the silent, black-robed sons of S. Benedict, that for five centuries had filed in never-ending procession into the monasteries of the continent. But now there was a stir abroad, men's minds had awakened to unwonted activity, the era of great universities had opened, the monasteries themselves were coming down from the mountain-side, out of the deep forests to the centres of intellectual life, where the ardent youth of Europe were gathering, eager for new things, or at least new ways and methods, and ready to give ear to every enthusiastic teacher. It seemed as if the intellect of the day were on the point of

breaking away from Christ, "the Light of the World," and from his Church, the bearer of that light to all ages. Where within her bosom was the organized power able to keep reason within its proper bounds and hold it under the guidance of Christianity? At that time Providence raised up two religious orders to be bulwarks against the storm, the Franciscans and the Dominicans. Thomas chose the latter, and put on the white habit of S. Dominic in the city of Naples at the end of his collegiate course.

His father was dead, his mother and sisters lived in the ancestral castle of Rocca Secca, his two brothers, officers in the army, were wandering over Italy and Germany in the train of the Emperor. The choice made by Thomas brought consternation to the proud family. They had hoped that he would one day rule as Imperial Abbott in the wealthy monastery of Monte Cassino as his uncle before him—and he had chosen to be a mendicant friar! Theodora, his mother, hurries off to Naples to reclaim her boy, for she had doubts about his vocation. The Dominicans, to spare him the trial and pain of the interview, hurried him off to Rome. Theodora follows in hot pursuit and arrives to find that he was on his way to Paris. Nothing daunted, she despatches swift couriers to her two older sons who happened at the time to be on military duty in Lombardy. They set watches to the passes, and between Bolsenna and Sienna capture the young novice travelling afoot with some of his elders; a bold, violent proceeding, unwarranted by the laws of the times, that brought the two over-zealous officers into trouble with Pope and Emperor. The mother has him now in her keeping and confines him securely in the castle of Rocca Secca; his jailers, fond jailers to be sure, the mother and the two sisters. Fancy not, I beg, a dungeon, darkness, and dampness, starvation and striving, thirst and torture. All the comforts of the old palace, daily intercourse and conversations with those who loved him but too well and not wisely, more frequent and lengthy intercourse with the Bible, which he then committed to memory from cover to cover, with the Sentences of the Lombard, and the works of

Aristotle: such was his imprisonment during two years. What was the meaning of it all? Simply this, the fond mother, fearing lest his choice had been too precipitate, would assure herself that he had acted deliberately and had a real call from heaven. She was too good a Christian, once convinced that all was right, to sadden him and strive against God. And who shall say that her love was wrong? Not I surely. But see, instead of yielding to the blandishments of his loving jailers and renouncing his vocation, he turned the tables, gained over his mother and his two sisters to his own cause, one of them entering a convent a few years later. They became his helpmates, and procured him from his Dominican brethren the books that relieved the tediousness of his stay in the castle. The two brothers in the army arrived on a furlough with the fixed intention to force Thomas to a final renunciation of his project. They insult him with foul jests and oaths, tear the habit off his back, and finally resort to a diabolical scheme, which it is hard to conceive brothers could adopt. They introduce into his room the most beautiful prostitute of Naples. No sooner did the novice become aware of her purpose and character than he snatched a blazing brand from the fireplace, and drove her shrieking from his apartment. This last insult was too much for the mother and the sisters to bear. With their connivance and help he was let down in a basket from the window of his room into the arms of religious brethren notified by his deliverers to await him. So he escaped like Paul at Damascus. He was taken to Naples and made his vows in the Order. The brothers, on complaint of the Order, were imprisoned, the Pope decided, appeal being made to the Holy See by the Order, that the young man should be allowed to follow the bent of his mind and heart. In the light of this story much that we read in journalism and more serious literature about monastic and conventual kidnapping vanishes into unsubstantial fiction, or worse, crystallizes into very hardened prejudice.

He was now nineteen years old. Since the age of five he had been at his books. Monte Cassino and Naples had

given him the best education they had. With such an intellectual capital he might have been set to work, it seems, in the active ministration of his Order. But his superiors judged that he had only now arrived at the period when his mind was prepared for perfection. Time, patience, care, and the best teachers are necessary to perfect the best intellects. Time is an essential condition for maturing a man as it is for ripening a fruit. Now-a-days we are in too great a hurry with education; ours is the hot-house process. To force nature beyond its pace is not to build up, but to pull down nature. They understood this in the Middle Ages. They built up their great men as their great cathedrals, stone upon stone, in labor and long years; and their great men, like their great cathedrals, stand throughout the centuries. Thomas' education was by no means finished. The only question was, where in all Europe could be found the master capable of bringing it to perfection. It was not a question of distance, or expense, or waiting; but simply a question of the best—the best school, the best teacher. And so behold him with the General of the Order slowly travelling afoot from Rome to Paris, from Paris to Cologne, where one Albertus Magnus, the *Doctor Universalis*, the wonder of his age, was lecturing; he was to be the master-builder of the most perfect mind the world has seen. As the two wayfarers came in view of Paris, the General said to his youthful companion: "Brother Thomas, what would you give to be the king of that city?"—"I would rather have S. John Chrysostom's treatise on the Gospel of S. Mathew than be the king of the whole of France." The young man who could thus feel and speak was worthy of the best master. There is no greater blessing for a mind than to come in contact with another mind more highly educated, more enthusiastic, and more experienced than itself. Albert had taken a wide and deep view of the intellectual world of his day. He saw clearly that pagan philosophy which was then overrunning the schools, should be seized and turned to the defence and glory of the Church, that Aristotle should be Christianized, and that the truths of Revelation should be

thrown into the form of a vast scientific organism through the application of Aristotelian philosophy to the dogmata of Revealed Religion. This work he began and S. Thomas completed.

The young student contrasted strangely with his fellows in the school of Albertus. He was conscious that his mind had not arrived at that maturity which makes the ventilation of difficult problems of much advantage; that now was the time to listen and learn, not to talk and teach; that truth is arrived at by slow degrees, through patient unwearied thought in silence and solitary self-communion. His companions cared not so much for truth as for the display of their reasoning powers. They loved to flash their keen dialectical steel in fence with gray-headed professors and disarm them, if they might.

Thinking themselves capable of handling any question, full of mental activity, buoyant with animal spirits, they held dialectical gymnastics, not the attainment of truth, to be the principal end of philosophy and learning. Was it any wonder that the silent scholar from Italy should appear dull to such fellows? "The great dumb Sicilian ox," they called him. So they nicknamed him, and poked fun at him, and laughed, and played practical jokes at his expense; piping and crowing like fledglings, flapping their young wings and bouncing at each other, and trying spur, beak, and claw in harmless dialectical sham-fights. How they dazzled the great dumb Sicilian ox! Yes, he could hold his peace, but when obedience to duty opened his lips, when bidden by the master to prove and defend publicly some important truth, he did so astonish all that Albert cried out to him: "Tu non videris tenere locum respondentis sed determinantis!—Thou seemest less a scholar than a teacher!" And to the scholars: "His bellowing will resound throughout the world."

The same year, 1245, that Thomas entered the school of Albertus at Cologne, he accompanied the master to Paris, and continued to study under his direction until the year 1248. Again he returned with his master to Cologne, and

aided him in teaching as assistant professor, or *Magister Studiorum*. In that position he taught philosophy, Scripture, and commented on the Sentences of the Lombard, the text-book of Theology in those days. In 1251 he was again sent to Paris to take his Academical degrees. He was twenty-seven years of age, he had been a student all his life, yet it was only then that he reached the degree of Bachelor. But he stood his examination with such brilliancy that he was at once called to a chair of Theology in that most famous of European Universities. Four years was he thus busied, and it is to this period that many of his smaller works must be attributed. He wrote little himself, he dictated to as many as three secretaries writing at once on three different subjects, a sentence to one on one subject, a sentence to the other on another. This feat of mental grasp is also attributed to Napoleon I. In 1256, after eight years of teaching, he took his degree of Doctor, and continued teaching and writing until 1261. It was during this period that he composed many of his greater works and notably the *Summa contra Gentiles*. This is what we should call in our days a treatise on the Christian Evidences. It is easier to read than the *Summa Theologica*, though the arguments of the latter are very clear. To know well the mind of S. Thomas both *Summæ* should be read, the *Contra Gentiles* first ; one is the complement and explanation of the other.

After two years' teaching in Paris, Thomas was called to Rome in 1261 by Urban IV. More than once did the Pope intimate his wish to raise the famous teacher to the highest ecclesiastical honors ; but Thomas constantly refused, holding the pursuit of knowledge to be the greatest honor and nobility to which he aspired. He accepted, however, in the Roman Court an office which was not invested with any dignity, yet brought him in constant contact with the Pope ; it was that of Master of the Palace, as one should say, official theological adviser to the Holy See. The Pontiff who secured his services in this capacity died in 1264. During the three years of his office Thomas displayed a marvellous

literary activity. At the request of the Pope he wrote his work *Contra Errores Græcorum*, with a view to bring about a reunion of the Greeks and Latins, his *Catena Aurea*, or commentary on the four Gospels, most of his commentaries on Aristotle, and many minor treatises.

Clement IV., the successor of Urban IV., who no less than his predecessor esteemed the genius and labors of the Angelical Doctor, appointed him to be Archbishop of Naples. But such were the sorrow and despondency exhibited by the troubled saint that the Pope in mercy withdrew the appointment. Freed from what he considered a grave calamity, Thomas began his *Summa Theologica*, the supreme work of his life, to which he gave every spare moment until his death.

The first part of this work was published in 1267 at Bologna, where Thomas sojourned three years, lecturing at the same time in the famous University of that city to immense audiences. In 1269 he was obliged to return to Paris on business of his Order, and for two years he occupied his former chair in that University at the request of King S. Louis, who held him in high esteem and frequently consulted him on grave affairs of state.

All the great universities of Europe engaged in a strange rivalry for the possession of this prince of teachers for a short period at least. The superiors of the Dominican Order were besieged with petitions from Naples, Padua, Bologna, Paris, Cologne, and other cities to allow them his presence. The General finally yielded to the instances of Naples; Thomas, after an absence of twenty-eight years, was sent back to his Alma Mater. His entrance into the city was a regal triumph; all classes, from the King to the peasant, crowded on his way to do him homage. Our century, with all its boasted esteem for knowledge, science, and education, could not present such a spectacle. His stay and labors in Naples were short, not over a year.

The sword had worn the sheath, the great mind had exhausted the body; toward the end of 1273 he became aware that the end could not be far; he closed his books,

laid aside his pen, and gave all his thoughts to that future life into which he was about to enter. Pope Gregory X. had convoked a General Council to meet at Lyons on the first of May, 1273. The main question to be treated was the reunion of the Greeks. No man in Europe was greater authority on that point than S. Thomas. He received a special order to be present. Though ill, he obeyed, and set out for Lyons. Not far from Naples he became too weak to proceed, and sought hospitality in the Benedictine convent of Fossa-Nuova. He had come to die among those who had been the teachers and guardians of his childhood. He passed gently away to the eternal home which had been the subject of his study and teaching his whole life-time, to the arms of the Eternal Being whom he sought to know, love, and serve from his infancy, on March 7, 1274, in the prime of manly life, being scarcely eight and forty years of age.

The Place of S. Thomas in the Church.

The chief work of Thomas is his "Theologic Sum," *Summa Theologica*; in it is resumed the result of all his studies in a systematic and rational form. It gives us, not only the philosophy of S. Thomas, but the science of the Middle Ages, called Scholastic, and that means theology considered as a universal science. In a word, the *Summa* is a scientific theory of Revelation.

Upon Roman and Greek philosophy in the first century of the Christian era, there came from the East the burden of a new teaching that introduced into the philosophical world new questions and a new light. The origin of evil, the rehabilitation through Christ of a fallen race, the common origin and end of mankind, the brotherhood of all men, humility, mortification, and charity, the triple personality without break of the unity of God, creation of the universe and man from nothingness, basis of the distinction between the Creator and the creature; these were affirmations that challenged the attention of men, and forced them to review the old philosophy handed down from Athens, Alexandria,

and Rome. At once a double current was produced. Christians like Dionysius Areopagita, Aristides, Athenagoras, Justinus, Irenæus, Pantenus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and others of less note, sought to conciliate the Christian teachings with the old philosophy. Anti-Christians like the Gnostics sought to eliminate the Christian teachings by misrepresenting them, or, like the Neo-Platonists, grappled with them manfully to strangle them. The tendency of the Christian school prevailed, and Christian Theology was born.

It may be resumed in these fundamental tenets:

1. There is a personal God, infinite in His Essence and attributes, anterior, external, and superior to the universe which, with all the beings it contains, is subject to the laws of His government and Providence.

2. Man is on his trial in this phase of his existence. He cannot escape in a future phase the consequences of the right use or abuse of liberty and the gracious aids given him by God in this phase.

3. The soul of man is immortal, and if he comes forth from his probation true to the laws of his destiny and his Creator, the next phase of his existence, unchangeable and lasting, shall be a knowledge of God and a union with God that shall satisfy all his cravings and give him supreme happiness. If, on the contrary, he be found wanting in his probation—that is, if he abuses to the satisfaction of his lower appetites the liberty and the aids he is graciously endowed with,—his future phase of existence shall be in deprivation of that knowledge, union, and happiness, and the deprivation shall be his eternal misery.

4. The world and man owe their origin to an action of God by which He has communicated to them being. In this communication, He was forced by no external power, and influenced only by love.

The philosophy that denied or ignored in its system these fundamental tenets was not and could not be Christian; the problem of Christian philosophy was to conciliate human reason and all its discoveries and knowledge of whatever kind with those tenets.

To vindicate those tenets against Paganism and the early heresies, the outgrowth of an imperfect understanding of Christianity, was the work of the Church from the beginning to the end of the fourth century. Chief among the defenders of Christianity during this period, I name Tertullian, Lactantius, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nuzianzum, Nemesius, St. Augustine. These constitute the school that goes by the name of "Patristic" philosophy, and their master in philosophy was Plato rather than Aristotle.

Between the patristic and the scholastic philosophy, properly so called, there intervened a transitional period of four centuries, during which philosophy was preserved as a science amid the evils, civil and religious, of the times, and took on gradually the features that made it scholastic. Its preservers and gradual transformers were Capella, Mamertus Claudianus, Boetius, Cassiodorus, Isidore of Seville, Licinianus, Beatus, Bede, Alcuin, Erigena, Rabanus Maurus, Gerbert, Peter Damian.

In the beginning of the eleventh century social circumstances arose that matured the scholastic philosophy. The struggle between the Papacy and the Empire, the renascence of the study of Roman jurisprudence, the agitation that preceded the Crusades, acted like electric shocks on the minds of those days, and men dashed into the abstrusest speculation of metaphysics. Students by the thousands, thirsty to know, gathered about renowned masters, and the mania of dialectics ran wild. Roscelin, Abelard, Anselm of Canterbury, William de Champeaux, Hugues de Saint Victor, Richard de Saint Victor, John of Salisbury, Peter Lombard, Alexander of Hales, William of Paris, Raymond Martin, Vincent of Beauvais, led up to Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, the two great lights of scholastic philosophy, in both of whom reason and faith found their most scientific conciliation, and Christian philosophy its highest expression.

Philosophy is the science of things in their ultimate causes. "What then," may be asked, "makes philosophy

to be scholastic?" I answer: "Aristotle." When you apply Aristotle's system and method of the science of things in their ultimate causes to the conciliation of faith and reason, revelation and nature, you get that school of Christian philosophy that goes by the name of scholastic philosophy.

S. Thomas has borrowed most from Aristotle, but he has not entirely neglected Plato. The combination of those two Greek masters is to be found with their best qualities in the *Angel of the Schools.* Thomas' angelic bias, if I may so describe his internal life, was Platonic; his school gifts, if I may so describe his intellect, were Aristotelic. The keen intellect of the Stagyrite, and the moral loftiness of Plato, corrected and purified by Christianity, made Aquinas the synthetic and analytic colossus that he was. If the philosophy of Aristotle has been a blessing to the Church, the theologic tendency of Plato has been of no less service to her. If Aquinas has been indebted to Aristotle for suggestions in analysis, he was equally beholden to Plato for synthetical suggestions. Through S. Thomas Socrates continues still to act on the thought of the world, and does so by means of the influence of his two great disciples, Plato and Aristotle, in the making of the Church's great doctor.

A volume might be written of the influence of S. Thomas on the Church and her teaching from his days down to our own. Sovereign Pontiffs have commended him, councils have echoed his praises, universities have followed the spirit of the councils, a countless host of learned men of every country have declared him to be unique, in his own line, and one of the world's intellectual giants. In our own days Leo XIII. has strongly recommended Catholic schools of theology to cling faithfully to the general philosophic system and doctrines of S. Thomas.

There have been many editions of the works of S. Thomas. The editions of his complete works—for many have been editions of separate treatises—are the following: Rome, 1570, 27 volumes; Venice, 1592, 27 volumes; Antwerp,

1612, 28 volumes; Paris, 1660, 23 volumes; Venice, 1745, 28 volumes; Parma, 1852, 24 volumes; Paris, 1853, 15 volumes. There is now going through the Papal Press of the Propaganda, Rome, a magnificent folio edition, of which seven volumes have already appeared. In the presence of this enormous mass of writing one wonders how a man, who died at the early age of forty-eight, could have done so much in so short a time.

In an old Dominican convent in Italy is the following fresco: The section of a cloister; kneeling before a crucifix a monk in the habit of S. Dominic, white tunic, black mantle; the head of the friar is high, broad, noble, intellectual, with well-defined tonsure; the face is strong and spiritual, and raised to the crucifix; the eyes gaze fixedly, as if questioning or wondering, the lips speak; the figure of the Lord is full of animation, as if moving away from the cross, the head bends down to the kneeling monk, there is life and light in the eyes, the lips move in speech: "'*Thoma, bene scripsiste de me, quam recipies a me pro tuo labore mercedem?*' '*Domini, non nisi te*,"—"'Thomas, thou hast written well of me. What reward dost thou ask?' 'None other than Thyself, Lord,'"—answers S. Thomas. In this legend and in the artistic representation of it is summed up the life of the Angel of the Schools. Centuries have gone by since he went to the reward which he then claimed, but the writings which the crucified Master is represented by the mystic painter as praising remain to be a light in the world, and the virtues of the Great Doctor remain to be a model to those whose prime wish is to teach in the Church of Christ crucified.

IV

THE GOSPEL OF PETER

THE GOSPEL OF PETER.

By Rev. ARTHUR CUSHMAN McGIFFERT, Ph.D., D.D.,

Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

It is perhaps not unfitting that some notice should be taken in our Society of Church History of what has proved to be one of the most interesting and important literary finds of recent years. I refer to the Greek MS., discovered by U. Bouriant in a tomb at Akhmîm, Egypt, in 1886, and first published in the fall of 1892. The MS. contains, as is well known, brief fragments of an early Christian Gospel and Apocalypse and two more extended fragments of the Book of Enoch. The fragment of the Apocalyse does not contain the name of its author, but toward the close of the Gospel fragment Peter is indicated as the writer of the Gospel in the sentence: "I Simon Peter and Andrew my brother took our nets and went away to the sea." We have references in early Christian literature to a Gospel and an Apocalypse of Peter, and there can be little doubt that the fragments in question belong to those long-lost works. I shall concern myself to-day only with the Gospel fragment, which has excited chief interest among scholars and has already given rise to an extended literature.

The fragment, which is about one hundred and fifty lines in length, contains only the passion and resurrection history and that only in an incomplete form. It begins abruptly in the midst of the account of the trial of the Lord with the words: "But none of the Jews washed his hands"; and breaks off with equal abruptness at the beginning of a para-

graph in which was evidently recorded the first appearance of the risen Christ to his disciples. The closing words are: "But I Simon Peter and Andrew my brother took our nets and went away to the sea; and there was with us Levi, the son of Alphæus, whom the Lord . . ."

The account of the passion is somewhat briefer than the corresponding portions of our canonical Gospels, while the account of the resurrection is considerably longer. Moreover, Peter's history of the passion is much more sober than his history of the resurrection, containing no more marvels than are found in the canonical accounts, while in connection with the resurrection two or three distinctly legendary features occur, which are wanting in our Gospels. At the same time, as compared with most of the Apocryphal Gospels known to us, the Gospel of Peter, at least so far as the extant fragment goes, is of a high character and remarkably free from exaggerations and absurdities.

Moreover, unlike many other Apocryphal works, it is in the main orthodox in character and can hardly therefore have emanated from any distinctly heretical school or party. It is true that Serapion, of Antioch, informs us that the Gospel of Peter was used by an heretical sect which he calls *Docetæ*, and it is further true that there are certain statements in our fragment which have been regarded as indicating its Docetic character, and many scholars have been led consequently to assert the heretical origin of the Gospel of which our fragment forms a part. But in my opinion the alleged Docetism of our fragment cannot be established. On the contrary, the fragment, as I pointed out in the *Independent* of May 4, 1893,[1] contains many statements that are irreconcilable with the assumption of its Docetic char-

[1] My articles upon the "Alleged Docetism of the Gospel of Peter," published in the *Independent* of May 4 and 11, 1893, are reprinted by request, at the close of this paper. I have been pleased to notice recently that the Docetism of our fragment is denied also by Tyler in the *Academy* of September 30, 1893. Tyler suggests that the statement, "He held his peace as if he in no wise suffered pain," may be the result of Peter's conception of Christ as "the Lord," with whose dignity the exhibition of bodily suffering would be incompatible.

acter. There is certainly nothing in it, and there seems to have been very little if anything in the Gospel of Peter known to Serapion, which could make it offensive to an ordinary Christian of the second century, unless he considered our four Gospels the only authentic accounts of our Lord's life and death. Of course if he regarded them thus no Gospel could be recognized by him which disagreed with them in any respect. But it is well known that it was long before our four Gospels were thus regarded by all. And that in the meantime its divergencies from this or that accepted Gospel were no bar to the use of another Gospel by this or that Christian—provided its theology was acceptable to him—is proved by the general recognition and use of the Gospel of John and of the Synoptics, the differences between which are at some points as striking as those between our fragment and the corresponding portions of the canonical Gospels.

I have dwelt upon this point because some writers have urged the character of the Gospel of Peter as an argument against its use by fathers of the second century. There is, in my opinion, no force in the argument, and whether our Gospel was used by such fathers or not must be determined solely on critical grounds. The question thus suggested is an interesting and important one and may well engage our attention for a little.

The earliest explicit reference to the Gospel of Peter, so far as is known, occurs in a work of the Serapion already mentioned addressed to the Church of Rhossus, about 200 A.D. A brief extract from this work is given by Eusebius in H. E., vi., 12, and is as follows: "For we brethren receive both Peter and the other apostles as we do Christ; but we reject, as men of experience, the writings falsely ascribed to them, knowing that such were not handed down to us. For when I visited you I supposed that all of you held to the true faith, and as I had not read the Gospel I said: 'If this is the only thing which occasions dispute among you, let it be read.' But now, having learned from what has been told me that their mind was involved in some heresy, I will

hasten to come to you again. Therefore, brethren, expect me shortly. But you will learn, brethren, from what has been written to you, that we perceived the nature of the heresy of Marcianus, and that not understanding what he was saying he contradicted himself. For having obtained this very Gospel from others who practised asceticism, that is from the successors of those who introduced it, whom we call Docetæ (for most of their opinions are in agreement with the teaching of these men), we were able to read it through, and we found most of it in accord with the true doctrine of the Saviour, but some precepts added thereto, which we have subjoined for you."

It is to be noticed that Serapion, while he does not accept the Petrine authorship of the so-called Peter Gospel, yet on the other hand does not say that the Gospel in question was written by a heretic or with an heretical purpose, but only that it was used in his time by men of ascetic tendencies whom he called Docetæ, and it is to be noticed, moreover, that he distinctly vouches for the orthodoxy of the greater part of the Gospel, his only criticism upon it being that it contained some precepts (apparently of an ascetic tendency) which were not in accord with the genuine teaching of Christ. The general character of the Gospel thus described is clear enough. It must have been in the main a reasonably faithful account of the life and work of Christ, with the emphasis laid upon a side of Christ's teaching which finds occasional expressions in our Gospels in such utterances as "Go sell that thou hast and give to the poor"; "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or land, for my name's sake shall receive an hundredfold and shall inherit everlasting life"; "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven"; "And there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it let him receive it." Origen, *e. g.* tells us that the Gospel of Peter asserted that the brethren of the Lord were children of Joseph by a former wife—an

assertion entirely in line with the tendency described by Serapion (Origen, *in Matt.*, x., 17).

The remark of Origen's just referred to contains his only reference to the Gospel of Peter, and in it he expresses no opinion as to its character. That he made use of the Gospel at other times is, however, rendered probable by a few resemblances in language and thought which have been discovered in his commentary on Matthew (see Swete, *The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*, pp. xxx. *sq.*).

Eusebius of Cæsarea mentions the Gospel of Peter in his *Hist. Eccles.*, iii., 3 and 25. In the former chapter he remarks: "But the so-called Acts of Peter, and the Gospel which bears his name, and the Preaching, and the Apocalypse, as they are called, we know have not been universally accepted, because no ecclesiastical writer, ancient or modern, has made use of testimonies drawn from them." And in Chapter xxv. he classes the Gospel in question among "those works that are cited by the heretics under the name of the Apostles," associating with it the Gospels of Thomas and of Matthias, and the "Acts of Andrew and John and the other Apostles," and he adds that "no one belonging to the succession of ecclesiastical writers has deemed these works worthy of mention in his writings." He then goes on to say that "the character of the style is at variance with Apostolic usage, and both the thoughts and the purpose of the things that are related in them are so completely out of accord with true orthodoxy that they clearly show themselves to be the fiction of heretics. Wherefore they are not to be placed even among the *νόθα*, but are all of them to be cast aside as absurd and impious." Finally, in introducing the extract from Serapion which has been already quoted, Eusebius says (vi., 12): "He [*i. e.* Serapion] wrote this last work to refute the falsehoods which that Gospel [*i. e.* the Gospel of Peter] contained, on account of some in the parish of Rhossus, who had been led astray by it into heretical notions." It is clear that Eusebius' opinion of the Gospel in question was very low, but there is no reason to

suppose that he ever saw the Gospel, and his statement that "no ecclesiastical writer, ancient or modern, has made use of testimonies drawn from them" [*i. e.* the Acts, the Gospel, the Preaching, and the Apocalypse of Peter] is certainly an exaggeration, at least as respects the Apocalypse, as we may learn, *e. g.* from the Muratorian fragment, and from Eusebius himself, Book vi., c. 14. And I believe it can be shown to be likewise an exaggeration as respects the Gospel, though as the latter work is explicitly and unambiguously referred to by name by no one before Eusebius' day except by Serapion and Origen, Eusebius can hardly be blamed, since he had not read the Gospel himself, for supposing that it had been used by no one else. Eusebius' condemnation of the Gospel evidently rests, not upon an adequate knowledge of its contents, but upon Serapion's rejection of it, and upon the fact that it had not found general acceptance in the Church.

Eusebius is followed by Jerome and by the author of the *Decretum Gelasii*, neither of whom adds anything to our knowledge of the work, neither of whom indeed seems ever to have seen it.[1]

Theodoret, *H. F.*, ii., 2, reports that the Nazarenes used a "so-called Gospel according to Peter,"[2] but his testimony is far from trustworthy, and the Gospel of Peter, of which our fragment forms a part, can hardly have been used by the sect which he describes, for that sect "honored Christ as a *just man*," Theodoret says, while our Gospel, on the contrary, makes much of his divinity.

These are the only explicit and unambiguous references to our Gospel known to us, but traces of an acquaintance with it have been discovered in other fathers, and go to show that it was more widely used in the early church than was formerly supposed. Cyril of Jerusalem seems to have been ac-

[1] Jerome *De vir. ill.*, c. 1: "Libri autem, e quibus unus actorum ejus inscribitur, alius Evangelii, tertius Prædicationis, quartus Apocalypseos, quintus Judicii inter Aprocryphas scripturas repudiantur." *Decretum Gelasii*: "Evangelium nomine Petri apostoli apocryphum."

[2] *οἱ δὲ Ναζωραῖοι Ἰουδαῖοί εἰσιν τὸν χριστὸν τιμῶντες ὡς ἄνθρωπον δίκαιον καὶ τῷ καλουμένῳ κατὰ πέτρον εὐαγγελίῳ κεχρημένοι.*

quainted with it (see the references to *Catech.*, xiii., given by Swete, *ibid.*, p. xxxi. *sq.*), and it is very likely that the Syrians, Aphraates and Ephraim, also were (see Zahn's *Evangelium des Petrus*, p. 65 *sq.*).[1] But more striking than any of the resemblances to be found in these writers are the hints of an acquaintance with our Gospel afforded by the author of the *Didascalia*, a work of the third century, which had its origin in Syria and is to-day extant only in a Syriac version, and the original Greek of which formed the basis of the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions. Resch has shown (*Agrapha*, p. 319 *sq.*) that the author of the *Didascalia* made large use of some Apocryphal Gospel, and Harnack has called attention to certain passages which make it very probable, if not certain, that the Gospel in question was our Peter Gospel (see Harnack's *Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus*, p. 41 *sq.*).

All the indications of a knowledge of our Gospel thus far referred to are found in authors who wrote later than the time at which we know, from Serapion's mention of it, that the Gospel was in existence. They are important, however, in that they show that it had something of a circulation and enjoyed some credit, at least in Syria, even in the third and fourth centuries. The question arises, was it used by any fathers earlier than Serapion, and if so, what character did it bear in their eyes. Most interesting of all are the indications of its use by Justin Martyr. It is true that it has been stoutly denied by many scholars (*e. g.* Zahn, Swete, Schubert, and others) that Justin knew the work at all, but the case seems to me a very plain one, even plainer indeed than it has yet been made. The passages cited by Harnack to prove Justin's use of our Gospel are as follows:

Apol., i., 40: "And how he foretells the conspiracy made against Christ by Herod, the King of the Jews, and the Jews themselves and Pilate, who was your governor among them, with his soldiers." The connection of Herod

[1] The same may be said of Dionysius of Alexandria (see the article by Bernard in the *Academy* of Sept. 30, 1893).

with the plot against Christ is found in none of our canonical Gospels; though it is found in Acts iv., 27. That Justin took the idea from Acts is, however, very improbable, and the similarity of the Peter Gospel and Acts at this point suggests—what is confirmed in some degree by other resemblances—that the author of the Acts and the author of the Peter Gospel drew in some cases from common sources, either oral or written, a conclusion which finds support in a probable similar use of common sources by Peter and the author of the third Gospel. If the statement of Justin in *Apol.*, i., 40, is derived from Peter, it is not impossible, as Harnack remarks, that Justin's words in *Dial.*, 103, "and when Herod succeeded Archelaus, having received the authority which was allotted him, Pilate sent him by way of compliment Jesus *bound* (*δεδεμένον*)," may rest not upon the statement of the Gospel of Luke, which they only approximately resemble, but upon that part of our Gospel immediately preceding the recovered fragment. They would serve to explain the situation which appears at the opening of our fragment—that that situation had its explanation in what immediately precedes is of course certain—and their presence in the Gospel is rendered probable, moreover, by the occurrence, in the same chapter of Justin's *Dialogue*, of other indications of the probable use of our Gospel.

Again in *Apol.*, i., 35, there is a more striking resemblance to Peter. Justin writes: "Tormenting him, they placed him on a judgment seat, and said judge us." Peter (vs. 6) records the same event, and the resemblance between his Gospel and Justin extends even to words.

Still again in *Dial.*, 97, occurs the very uncommon phrase *λάχμον βάλλοντες* for "casting lots." The phrase is not found in the canonical Gospels, nor in the Psalm from which Justin quotes a little above in the same chapter, where *κλῆρον* is used instead of *λάχμον* (Ps. xxii., 19). On the other hand, Peter (vs. 12) reads *λάχμον ἔβαλλον*, and the resemblance is very complete and striking.

Apol., i., 50 and *Dial.*, 53, have also been referred to by Harnack. In both of these chapters it is said that "*after*

his crucifixion all his friends forsook him," a statement which reminds us of Peter, vs. 26. It is noticeable that though the canonical Gospels speak of Christ's disciples as forsaking him *before* his crucifixion, they say nothing of such action on their part *after* the crucifixion, while Peter does. Harnack refers also to *Dial.*, 108, which contains a parallel to Peter, s. 21, but the passage also resembles Matthew almost as closely and might have come from it.

But in addition to these indications of a knowledge of Peter's Gospel which have been pointed out by Harnack and others, there are other hints of such knowledge on Justin's part which I think are worth noticing. Justin frequently speaks of Christ as crucified by the *Jews*; indeed he emphasizes the agency of the Jews in that event as Peter likewise does: *e. g. Apol.*, c. 35, where the words occur in immediate connection with another reference to Peter already mentioned; and c. 38, which is especially significant, for there Justin attributes the scourgings, buffetings, etc., and the casting of lots for Christ's garments to the Jews instead of to the Romans, just as Peter does in vss. 6 and 12; *cf.* also *Dial.*, 17 and 85.

Still further, it is worthy of notice that in *Apol.*, 32, a chapter in which occur, as will be pointed out, other indications of a use of Peter, Justin emphasizes the continuance of a ruler in Judea until the coming of Christ, and then goes on to say: "After whose crucifixion the land was straightway delivered to you as spoil of war." May it not be that the emphasis by Peter of the Kingship of Herod at the time of the crucifixion was due to the influence of the prophecy in Gen. xlix., and that Justin's use of the same prophecy was colored by Peter's treatment of Herod?

But more than this, the christology of Justin, which has been supposed by many to indicate the influence, direct or indirect, of the Gospel of John, seems to me to indicate at least the joint if not the exclusive influence of the Peter Gospel. For instance, in *Dial.*, 54, it is said twice that "Christ has blood not from the seed of man but from the power (δύναμις) of God," and the same statement is found

also twice in *Apol.*, 32. The same thought is also expressed in *Dial.*, 76, though there it is simply said that he "has blood but not from men." The idea is similar to that of John i., 13, but Justin has δύναμις in both cases, instead of θέλημα, and we are at once reminded of the δύναμις of Peter, vs. 19. The use of the word δύναμις four times in two of the passages referred to (a word which does not once occur in John, either Gospel or Epistles), and of ἔχει αἷμα in all of them, certainly looks as if Justin drew from some written source, and that source not the Gospel of John. And when the use made by Peter of the word δύναμις, and his constant tendency to exalt Christ and to emphasize his divinity, are taken into consideration, it is certainly not unlikely, to say the least, that Justin felt the influence of Peter, and it is not impossible that in its early chapters the Gospel of Peter may have presented a pneumatic christology similar to that of Justin. If that were so, the peculiar phenomena in connection with Justin's relation to John's Gospel might be explained by Justin's use of the Gospel of Peter where he has been supposed to use John. For it is to be noticed that Justin's christology, though in some respects resembling that of John as distinguished from the Synoptists, is yet not Johannine.

But, still further, it is very significant that Justin says, in *Dial.*, 61: "But I will give you another testimony from the Scriptures, that in the beginning before all creatures God begat a certain rational power (δύναμιν λογικὴν) from himself, which is also called by the Holy Spirit Glory of the Lord, and again Son and again Wisdom and again Angel, and again God and again Lord and Logos. . . ."

Again Justin says, in *Apol.*, 32 (the chapter already referred to): "The first power (δύναμις) after God the father and Lord of all is the λόγος, who is also the Son"; and in the next chapter (33): "It is wrong therefore to think of the Spirit and the Power from God (τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ) as anything else than the λόγος who is also the first-born of God"; and in chap. 23: "Jesus Christ hath been begotten properly God's only son, being

his λόγος and πρωτότοκος and δύναμις." It is true that the word δύναμις occurs in Luke i., 35, a passage which is evidently in Justin's mind when he writes the closing words of chap. 35 of his *Apology*; but it is to be noticed that Luke says δύναμις ὑψίστου, while Justin says not only δύναμις θεοῦ, which differs from it only verbally, but also δύναμις παρὰ θεοῦ, which is another thing altogether; and it is to be noticed still further that δύναμις is not identified by Luke with Christ or with the λόγος as by Justin; indeed, there is no hint in Luke of that hypostatization of the δύναμις which is characteristic of the christology of Justin. It is noticeable, indeed, that the word δύναμις is neither in Luke nor anywhere else in the New Testament used as Justin uses it. But in the Gospel of Peter, vs. 19, it is so used, δύναμις being there hypostatized just as Justin hypostatizes it, and bearing apparently the same relation to the flesh as it bears in the mind of Justin when he says (*Apol.*, 32): "The first power after God, the father and Lord of all, is the λόγος, who is also the Son; who being made flesh became man in the way we shall relate in what follows." *Cf.* in addition to these passages, *Dial.*, 48, 128, 132, 139.[1]

There can be little doubt, it seems to me, in view of all that has been said, that Justin knew and used the Gospel of Peter, and in the light of this fact the disputed phrase in *Dial.*, 106, ἀπομνημονεύματα αὐτοῦ, is to be interpreted. It is now generally admitted that the αὐτοῦ refers not to Christ but to Peter, who is mentioned in the immediate context, and that Justin is speaking consequently of "memoirs of Peter." These memoirs have quite commonly been supposed to be the Gospel of Mark, but in the light of Justin's use of the Gospel of Peter, the words may well be taken to

[1] Another though vaguer hint of the Gospel of Peter, vs. 19, occurs possibly in *Dial.*, 38, where Trypho says: "You utter many blasphemies when you seek to persuade us that this crucified man was with Moses and Aaron and spoke to them in the pillar of cloud, that he then became man and was crucified and ascended to heaven (σταυρωθῆναι καὶ ἀναβεβηκέναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν) and cometh again to the earth and is to be worshipped"; the ascension being put immediately after the crucifixion.

refer to that Gospel; and if they be so taken, they constitute the earliest explicit mention of it known to us.

But there exist also some slight but interesting points of resemblance between our fragment and the Epistle of Barnabas. The spirit of hostility to the Jews which runs through that Epistle is in accord with the spirit which actuated the author of our Gospel, and in Barn., chap. 7, we find one or two striking parallels. In that chapter we read: "Because they [*i. e.* the Jews] shall see him in that day having a scarlet robe about his body down to his feet; and they shall say is not this he whom we once despised and pierced and mocked and crucified? Truly this is he who then declared himself to be the Son of God." Especially noticeable in this passage is the fact that the Jews are represented as having "pierced and mocked and crucified" him, just as in the Gospel of Peter and Justin, while in the canonical Gospels it is the Roman soldiers who thus treat Christ. Again, in the same chapter occur the words *ἐποτίζετο ὄξει καὶ χολῇ*, and farther down, *ποτίζειν χολὴν μετὰ ὄξους*. Peter reads *ποτίσατε αὐτὸν χολὴν μετὰ ὄξους, καὶ κεράσαντες ἐπότισαν*. The corresponding verses in the canonical Gospels are quite different.

Again, in Barnabas, chap. 15, it is said: "Wherefore we keep the eighth day with joyfulness: the day on which Jesus rose from the dead and was manifested and ascended into heaven." The Gospel of Peter is the only Gospel that explicitly asserts that Christ ascended on the day of his resurrection (vs. 56: "He hath gone away to the place whence he was sent forth"). Barnabas, of course, might have got his idea from Luke's Gospel—at least Luke's words *may* be so interpreted,—but Acts (chap. i.) distinctly contradicts it, and the other Gospels furnish no warrant for it.

Itwould seem that some connection, direct or indirect, between Barnabas and the Gospel of Peter must be assumed upon the basis of these resemblances, but what that connection is I am not prepared to say.

Conybeare (in the *Academy* for October 21 and De-

cember 23, 1893) has called attention to a possible reminiscence of our Gospel in the Epistle of Polycarp, chap. 7, where it is said "whosoever does not confess the *testimony of the cross* is of the devil." The connection in which these words occur—the advent being mentioned in the previous sentence, the resurrection and second coming in the following—leads Conybeare to think that the reference is to the preaching in Hades, and particularly to the response from the cross recorded in Peter's Gospel, vs. 42. The suggestion is an ingenious one; Polycarp's words may fairly be interpreted as Conybeare interprets them, but in the absence of other evidence they are hardly sufficient to justify us in asserting that Polycarp knew our Gospel.[1]

Before leaving the subject of the use of the Gospel of Peter by the early fathers, I should like to call attention to the possibility that many of the agrapha which we find scattered through those fathers belonged originally to the Gospel of Peter. If that Gospel was known and used by the author of the *Didascalia*, by Justin Martyr, and by others, as

[1] It is worthy of notice that the so-called Acts of Pilate exhibit the same spirit of hostility to the Jews and the same tendency to minimize Pilate's guilt which characterize the Gospel of Peter, and though they make large use of our canonical Gospels there is some reason to think that their author or authors were acquainted with the Peter Gospel. Such acquaintance is asserted, for instance, by Zahn (S. 57 *sq.*), while Schubert (S. 176 *sq.*) has attempted to show that the dependence is the other way, and that Peter used the Acts of Pilate in an earlier version than we now possess. Schubert's opinion, however, is baseless; if there be any dependence of the one upon the other, the Acts and not the Gospel must be regarded as secondary. But our lack of knowledge respecting the early revisions of the Acts of Pilate and the date of their composition makes any conclusions which we may reach at present of comparatively little value.

It may be remarked also that attention has been called by Swete (p. xxix.) to some resemblances between the Gospel of Peter and the Sibylline Oracles (viii. 288 *sq.*), but the resemblances are so faint that not much can be based upon them, though some sort of relationship between the two works is not improbable.

More interesting is a resemblance between our fragment and the Visio Isaiæ, pointed out by Badham in the *Athenæum* of December 17, 1892, which seems to imply that the author of that work was acquainted with the Peter Gospel. But the origin and date of the Visio Isaiæ are still too uncertain to enable us to draw satisfactory conclusions from its apparent use of the Gospel.

has been indicated, it is not unnatural to regard it as the source at least of some of those apocryphal words, and deeds, and events which they record. Among these I may mention the agraphon: "There shall be heresies and schisms," which is given as an utterance of Christ both by Justin (*Dial.*, 35) and by the *Didascalia* (vi., 5); so also the words uttered at Christ's baptism: "Thou art my son; to-day have I begotten thee," which are likewise found both in Justin (*Dial.*, 88, 103), and in the *Didascalia* (ii., 32), as well as in Codex Bezæ (Luke iii., 22). In addition to these I may call attention to the story of the woman taken in adultery, which is found in the *Didascalia* (ii., 24) and in Codex Bezæ (John vii., 53 *sq.*) and which Harnack has given reasons for supposing stood in the Gospel of Peter. Finally the well-known agraphon, "Love covereth a multitude of sins," which appears not only in I. Peter, but also in the *Didascalia* (ii., 3), in the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians (chap. 49), in the Homily of Clement (chap. 16), and in Clement of Alexandria, (*Pæd.* iii., 12). It would be interesting, were there time, to examine some of the agrapha found in those fathers who can be shown to have known the Gospel of Peter, and to indicate how the occurrence of the same agrapha in still other writings leads in some cases to the conclusion that their authors also knew that Gospel. I believe this can be shown with reasonable probability to be true at least of Clement of Alexandria and the author of the homily which is commonly called Second Clement. And I believe that from a comparison of the two latter it may be shown to be not improbable that the noted agraphon which occurs in II. Clement, 12, and in another form in Clement Alex., *Strom.*, iii., 13, and in its enlarged form is said by the latter to occur in the Gospel of the Egyptians, was contained also in the Peter Gospel.

Before leaving this subject attention should be called to the occurrence in Peter's account of the resurrection of the interesting words: "Hast thou preached to the sleepers? And a response was heard from the cross: Yea" (vss. 41 and 42). The resemblance to I. Peter, iii., 19, is striking, and

some connection between that Epistle and our Gospel is suggested not only by this notable point of contact, but also by the probable occurrence in our Gospel, as indicated above, of the agraphon, "Love covereth a multitude of sins," which is found in I. Peter iv., 8. What the connection is I am not prepared to say, but it is certain that our Gospel cannot be adequately understood until its place in the early Christian literature that bears the name of Peter has been satisfactorily determined.

It will hardly do to bring this paper to a close without at least a brief discussion of the relation of the Gospel of Peter to our canonical Gospels. That the author of the Gospel of Peter knew and used the Gospel of Mark seems evident and is so generally admitted that it is not worth our while to spend any time in the attempt to prove it. But over and above its agreement with Mark our Gospel contains matter found only in one or another of the other three Gospels. Did our author then know and use any or all of them? It is impossible on this occasion to enter into a detailed discussion of this complicated question. A few very general observations must suffice.

In common with Matthew alone the Gospel of Peter contained evidently an account of the washing of Pilate's hands (the δε at the beginning of the fragment makes this clear) and of the earthquake following the crucifixion (but in the Peter Gospel the earthquake occurs not while Christ is still on the cross, but at the moment that his dead body is laid upon the earth—a very notable circumstance, for the statement is entirely opposed to the alleged Docetic tendency of our fragment). In common with Matthew it has also an account of the watch set at the tomb. The resemblances to Luke are less marked. In common with Luke alone Peter brings Herod into connection with the trial of Christ (but the connection is very different in the two cases); represents one of the malefactors as acknowledging Christ's innocence (but again there is a marked difference between the two accounts), and speaks of the remorse of those who had crucified Christ (but in this case too the connection is

very loose). The chief resemblances of our fragment to John's Gospel are its paschal chronology and its apparent record of an appearance of Christ to some of his apostles at the Sea of Galilee.

On the other hand, a comparison of our fragment with the corresponding portions of the canonical Gospels reveals some very remarkable omissions which are exceedingly difficult to explain if it be assumed that our author knew and used those Gospels. It is to be noticed as very significant in this connection that our author omits no circumstance of importance recorded in Mark, while he omits much that is found in one or more of the other three Gospels. I desire to call attention here to only a few of the most striking of such omissions.

Of the occurrences recorded in Matthew alone, Peter omits the imprecation of the people, "His blood be upon us and upon our children," a remark so entirely in accord with the spirit and tendency of our author and calculated so capitally to voice his anti-Jewish sentiments that it is difficult to explain its omission if he read it in his sources; he omits also the rending of the rocks, as well as the opening of the tombs and the coming forth of the dead (Matt. xxvii., 52 *sq.*), a most surprising omission, all the more surprising when we consider the elaborate use made of the latter incident by the Acts of Pilate. Moreover Peter fails to mention the earthquake which occurred in connection with the descent of the angel and the rolling away of the stone from the door of the tomb, an omission especially difficult to explain when we realize Peter's tendency just at this point to magnify the marvellous element. Finally, Peter says nothing of the appearance of Christ to the women on the day of the resurrection (Matt. xxviii., 9 *sq*). His silence upon this subject seems all the more remarkable, when it is noticed that both John and the author of the appendix to the Gospel of Mark thought it necessary to follow Matthew in recording it. On the other hand, the original Mark says nothing about it, and Luke, who follows Mark but betrays no acquaintance with the Gospel of Matthew, at least in its present

form, likewise omits it. If Peter knew our Matthew, his omission of such an important event seems to me quite inexplicable.

So far as Luke and John are concerned, Peter's omissions of circumstances recorded by them are more numerous but no more striking. The most notable of these are the visit of Peter and John to the tomb and all the Jerusalem appearances recorded in John, and the appearance of Christ to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, recorded in Luke. Moreover Peter is entirely inconsistent with Acts i. where the disciples are represented as remaining in Jerusalem and communing there with Christ for forty days. In fact it is to be said with emphasis that Peter's exclusion of all the appearances of Christ upon the day of his resurrection—appearances which are made so much of by Matthew, Luke, and John, but are entirely omitted by Mark—renders it very difficult to assume an acquaintance on his part with Matthew-Luke, and John. It would certainly be to the interest of any Gospel writer to put the appearances of Christ at as early a day as he had authority for doing, and at the same time to emphasize if he could the fact that they took place on the first day of the week, the Lord's day. But Peter mentions no appearance until at least a week after the resurrection, and though he refers to the "Lord's day," twice in the brief fragment which we have, he does not seem to have mentioned the fact that the appearance which he does record took place on that day.

These remarkable omissions, I am free to confess, seem to me to outweigh all the resemblances—verbal or otherwise—which have been shown to exist between our fragment and the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John. Of course, our fragment is so brief that it is unsafe to make sweeping generalizations, but, so far as it goes, it presents in relation to the three Gospels mentioned, practically the same kind of phenomena which are presented by Matthew and Luke in relation to each other,—phenomena which are now generally held by New Testament scholars to be due not to the use by either Matthew or Luke of the other, but to their use of a

common source. As has been already remarked, there is every reason to suppose that Peter, like Matthew and Luke, made use of the Gospel of Mark, or of an original Gospel closely resembling it; and there is also reason to suppose that he was acquainted with the additional source or sources employed by Matthew and Luke, whether that common source—or any of those sources—was the Matthew λόγια or not.

But if Peter's acquaintance with the Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John be denied, or at least regarded as improbable, how does our Gospel compare with them in age? Does it mark an early or a late stage in the process of Gospel formation? To answer this question it is necessary to take into account the uncanonical events which are recorded in our fragment,—events which our author may have found, in part at least, in the sources from which he drew, or may have added with his own hand. Such events are very numerous, but most of them are of such a character as to throw no light upon the proposed question. A few of them, however, are significant: for instance, in vs. 25 it is said that "the Jews, and the elders, and the priests, knowing what evil they had done themselves, began to lament and to say, 'Woe for our sins! the judgment is at hand and *the end of Jerusalem*'"; so also vss. 26 and 27, where the author says: "For we were sought for by them [*i. e.* by the Jews] as malefactors and *as minded to burn the temple.* And besides all this we fasted and sat down mourning and weeping night and day until the Sabbath." Still more significant are the legendary features which attach themselves to Peter's account of the resurrection. Such, for instance, are the statements that the stone moved aside of *itself* from the door of the tomb; that three figures issued from the tomb, two of them, with heads reaching to heaven, supporting the third, whose head towered above the heavens; that a cross followed these figures and a voice was heard from it in response to a question from heaven. In addition to these legendary details, the account of Peter contains some exaggerations as compared with the corresponding accounts in the canonical

Gospels: *e. g.* the size of the stone and the number of seals placed upon it are magnified (*cf.* Matthew), and the tomb thus sealed is inspected by a crowd of people from Jerusalem and the surrounding country. Such features as these certainly militate against an early date for our fragment; but, on the other hand, it is to be noticed that Matthew, as already remarked, contains some marvels not found in Peter, as striking as any that occur in the latter; and that Peter's omission of the Jerusalem appearances of Christ gives his account a markedly archaic look. In favor of a later date than that of our canonical Gospels have been urged the employment of ἡ κυριακή for the Lord's day, and the exclusive use throughout our fragment of ὁ κύριος instead of Ἰησοῦς. The former has considerable weight; the latter on the other hand, *may* indicate not a later date, but only the influence of Paul (see Tyler's articles in the *Academy*, July 29 and Sept. 30, 1893). On the whole, we shall perhaps not be far out of the way if we assign the Gospel, of which our fragment forms a part, to the early decades of the second century. Internal considerations point to that period, and we are prevented, in any case, from bringing its composition down to a much later date by the fact that it was known and used by Justin Martyr.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I.—Editions.

Bouriant, U. Editio princeps (in *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire.* Tom. ix., fasc. 1, pp. 137-147) Paris, 1892.

Harnack, Adolf. Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apocalypse des Petrus (*Sitzungsbericht der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1892. S. 895-903, 949-965. Reprinted with additions in von Gebhardt und Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur.* Bd. ix., Heft 2. Leipzig, 1893. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Ausgabe, Leipzig, 1893).

S., H. B. [H. B. Swete.] The Apocryphal Gospel of Peter. The Greek text of the newly discovered fragment. London, 1892. Revised edition with some corrections from the manuscript. London, 1893.

Robinson, J. Armitage, and Montague Rhodes James. The Gospel according to Peter and the Revelation of Peter. Two lectures on the newly recovered fragments, together with the Greek texts. London, 1892. Second edition, London, 1892.

Lods, Adolphe. Evangelii secundum Petrum et Petri Apocalypseos quae supersunt ad fidem codicis in Ægypto nuper inventi cum Latina versione et dissertatione critica. Parisiis, 1892.

Lods, Adolphe. L'Évangile et l'Apocalypse de Pierre publiés pour la première fois d'après les photographies du manuscrit de Gizéh. Avec un appendice sur les rectifications a aporter au texte Grec du Livre d'Hénoch. Paris, 1893.

Funk, Dr. von. Fragmente des Evangeliums und der Apocalypse des Petrus (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1893. Heft 2, pp. 255–288).

Lods, Adolphe. Reproduction en héliogravure du manuscrit d'Hénoch et des écrits attribués à Saint Pierre avec introduction (*Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire.* Tome ix., fasc 3, 1893 : L'Évangile et l'Apocalypse de Pierre, pp. 219-228. Pl. i-x).

Zahn, Theodor. Das Evangelium des Petrus. Das kürzlich gefundene fragment seines Textes aufs neue herausgegeben, übersetzt und untersucht. (Reprint of two articles in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Jahrg. 1893, Heft 2 und 3, with some additions.) Erlangen und Leipzig, 1893.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. Das Petrus-Evangelium über Leiden und Auferstehung Jesu. (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1893. Heft 4, pp. 439–454).

Manen, W. C. van. Het Evangelie van Petrus. Tekst en Vertaling. Leiden, 1893.

Swete, H. B. The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter. Edited with an introduction, notes, and indices. London, 1893.

Gebhardt, Oscar von. Das Evangelium und die Apocalypse des Petrus. Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgegeben. Leipzig, 1893.

Lundborg, Matth. Det s. k. Petrusevangeliet, ett nyfunnet fragment ur en fornkristlig Apokryf. Lund, 1893.

II. Translations and Discussions.

Ménégoz, E. (*Le Temoignage*, Nov. 5, and 12, 1892).

Lods, Adolphe, Fragments d'évangile et d'apocalypse découverts en Égypte (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Nov.–Dec., 1892, pp. 331–333).

Bormann. Das Evangelium des Petrus. (*Deutsche Zeitung*, 30 Nov. 1892.) [Contains a translation.]

Bratke, Ed. Neuentdeckte Stücke der jüdischen und altchristlichen Literatur. I. [on the Gospel]. II. [on the Apocalypse]. (*Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1892, Dec. 2, Sp. 567–570 ; Dec. 9, Sp. 575–578.)

Σ. The Gospel of Peter (*The Academy*, Dec. 3, 1892, p. 509).

Headlam, Arthur C. Newly Discovered Christian Documents. I. The Gospel of Peter. II. The Apocalypse of Peter. (*The Guardian*, 1892 ; Dec. 7, pp. 1883–1884 ; Dec. 14, p. 1929.)

Redpath, Henry A. The Gospel according to Peter (*The Academy*, Dec. 10, 1892, p. 544).

SCHÜRER, E. Griechische Fragmente des Buches Henoch, des Evangeliums Petri und der Apocalypse Petri (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Dec. 10, 1892, Sp. 609–612).

BONWETSCH, N. Aus dem Evangelium des Petrus (*Mittheilungen und Nachrichten für die evangelische Kirche in Russland*, Nov.–Dec., 1892, S. 538–543). [Contains a translation.]

CROOKS, G. R. The Gospel of Peter. (*Review of the Churches*, Dec. 15, 1892.)

NICHOLSON, E. W. B. The Gospel according to Peter (*The Academy*, Dec. 17, 1892, p. 567; and Dec. 24, p. 593).

BADHAM, F. P. The New Apocryphal Literature (*The Athenæum*, Dec. 17, 1892, pp. 854–855).

SCHUBERT, H. VON. Neue Funde auf dem Gebiete der urchristlichen Literatur. I. Das Evangelium des Petrus. II. Die Apocalypse des Petrus. (*Die christliche Welt*, 19 Dec., 1892, und 12 Jan., 1893, Sp. 7–12, 50–54).

BARNARD, J. H. The Gospel according to Peter (*The Academy*, Dec. 24, 1892, p. 593).

THAYER, J. HENRY. The New Gospel according to Peter. (*The Boston Commonwealth*, Dec. 31, 1892, p. 2 *sq.*).

DAVIES, T. W. The Gospel and the Apocalypse of Peter and Other Discoveries (*The Baptist*, 1893, Jan. 13 and 20).

MURRAY, J. O. F. Evangelium secundum Petrum (*The Expositor*, Jan., 1893, pp. 50–61). [Contains the translation of Robinson.]

HARRIS, J. RENDEL. The newly Recovered Gospel of St. Peter with a Full Account of the Same. London and New York, 1893. [Contains a translation.]

MEUNIER, CHARLES. L'Évangile selon Saint Pierre. Traduction française avec notes. Boulogne-sur-mer, 1893.

SABATIER, A. (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Jan.–Feb., 1893, pp. 76–78). [A review of Lods.]

KUNZE, JOH. Das neuaufgefundene Bruchstück des sogenannten Petrusevangeliums übersetzt und beurtheilt. Leipzig, 1893.

SCHÜRER, E. Die Ausgaben von Robinson, Lods und Harnack (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Jan 21, 1893, Sp. 33–37).

BENNETT, E. N. The Gospel according to Peter (*The Classical Review*, Feb., 1893, pp. 40–42).

BRADNER, LESTER, Jr. An Important Discovery of MSS. (*The Biblical World*, Jan., 1893, pp. 33–35).

HARNACK, ADOLF. Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke des Petrusevangeliums und der Petrusapokalypse (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, Jan., 1893, S. 36–58).

WILAMOWITZ-MÖLLENDORF, W. VON. Conjecturen zu den Petrus Fragmenten (*Göttinger Index Scholarum für das Sommersemester*, 1893, S. 31 *sq.*).

MANCHOT, K. Die neuen Petrusfragmente (*Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1893: Feb. 8, Sp. 126–143; Feb. 15, Sp. 160–166; Feb. 22, Sp. 176–183; März. 1, Sp. 201–213).

Bratke, Ed. Studien über die neuentdeckten Stücke der jüdischen und altchristlichen Literatur (*Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1893 : Feb. 17, Sp. 73–79 ; März 3, Sp. 97–102.)

Nösgen, C. Der Fund von Akhmîm (*Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, 1893 : Feb. 19, Sp. 125–128 ; Feb. 26, Sp. 141–144 ; März 8, Sp. 149–156).

Hall, Isaac H. The newly Discovered Apocryphal Gospel of Peter (*The Biblical World*. Feb., 1893, pp. 88–98). [Contains a translation.]

Haller, W. Ein Fragment des Evangeliums Petri (*Kirchlicher Anzeiger für Württemberg*. 1893, No. 17, Sp. 163–165). [Contains a translation.]

A Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter found at Akhmîm in Egypt. Translation from the Greek. London (Norgate), 1893.

Nestle, E. Lc. 24.4, Act 1,10 und das Petrus-Evangelium (*Evangelisches Kirchenblatt für Württemberg*, 1893, No. 4).

Soden, H. von. Das Petrusevangelium und die canonischen Evangelien (*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1893, Heft 1, S. 52–92).

Lejay, Paul. L'Évangile de Pierre (*Revue des études Grecques*, Janvier–Mars, 1893, pp. 59–84). [Contains a translation.]

Z [Öckler, O.] Die neuentdeckten Petrus-pseudepigraphin (*Beweis des Glaubens*, März, 1893, S. 124–126).

Smyth, Egbert C. [A Review of Robinson, Harris, Headlam, and Harnack.] (*Andover Review*, Mar.–April, 1893, pp. 262–266).

Thayer, J. Henry. The Gospel according to Peter and the Revelation of Peter. [A review of Robinson and James.] (*The New World*, Mar. 1893, pp. 170–174.)

Potwin, Thomas Stoughton. The Gospel of Peter (*The Independent*, Mar. 30, 1893, p. 432).

Schürer, E. (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Apr. 1, 1893, Sp. 187–188.)

Davis, Ozora S. The Gospel according to Peter. (*Hartford Seminary Record*, April 1893, pp. 177–188). [Contains a translation.]

Richardson, Ernest C. [A review of Lods, Harnack, Robinson and Harris.] (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, April, 1893, pp. 319–321.)

Maas, Rev. Anthony J., S. J. The lately Recovered Apocryphal Gospel. (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1893, pp. 313-328.) [Contains a translation.]

Moulton, Rev. J. H. The Gospel of Peter and the Four. (*The Expository Times*, Apr. 1893.)

Reinach, S. L'évangile de St. Pierre. Paris, 1893.

Kihn, H. Ein patristischer Fund: Evangelium und Apokalypse des heil. Petrus. (*Der Katholik*, April, 1893, pp. 297-310.)

McGiffert, A. C. The Alleged Docetism of the Gospel of Peter. (*The Independent*, 1893, May 4, p. 615 ; May 11, pp. 646-647.)

Badham, F. P. Additions to the Gospel of St. Peter. (*The Athenæum*, May 13, 1893, pp. 605–606.)

MARTINEAU, Dr., on the Gospel of Peter. (*The Academy*, May 20, 1893, p. 441.) [Account of a lecture delivered by Dr. Martineau.]

AZN, W. FRANCKEN. Het onlangs gevonden Petrus-evangelie. Vertaling met een enkele aanteekening. (*Geloofen en Vrijheid*, 1893, p. 188-209.)

ROVERS, M. A. N. Eene nieuwe ontdekking. (*Bibl. u. mod. Theol. en lett.*, 1893, p. 605-620.)

MANEN, W. C. VAN. Het evangelie van Petrus. I. De ontdekking. Literatuur. II. Echtheid. Tekst. Inhoud (vs. 1-27). III. Inhoud (vs. 28-60). Karakter. Verhouding tot andere evangeliën. Herkomst. Lotgevallen. Waarde. Nagekomen Literatuur. (*Theologische Tijdschrift*, 1893: No. 3, p. 317-333; No. 4, p. 379-432; No. 5, p. 517-572.)

HOLTZMANN, H. (*Theologischer Jahresbericht*, Bd. XII., *1892*, S. 120.)

LÜDEMANN, H. (*Ibid.*, pp. 171–172.)

FUNK, DR. VON. Eine Spur oder Nachwirkung des Petrusevangeliums in dem Dialog des Adamantius *de recta in Deum fide*. (*Theologische Quartalschrift*, 1893, S. 349.)

SCHUBERT, HANS VON. Die Composition des Pseudopetrinischen Evangelienfragments. Mit einer synoptischen Tabelle als Ergänzungsheft. Berlin, 1893. ——— Das Petrusevangelium. Synoptische Tabelle nebst Uebersetzung und kritischem Apparat. Berlin, 1893.

VÖLTER, DANIEL. Petrusevangelium oder Aegypterevangelium? Eine Frage bezüglich des neuentdeckten Evangelienfragments. Tübingen 1893. [Contains a translation.]

Z[OECKLER, O.] Nochmals die Petrus-pseudepigraphen. (*Beweis des Glaubens*, 1893, Mai, S. 204–205.)

KEMBLE, REV. D. The true Gospel according to Peter. (*Methodist Review*, May–June, 1893.)

An Emendation of the Gospel of Peter. [Proposed by Dr. Sandys.] (*The Academy*, June 3, 1893, p. 446.)

BARNES, W. E. The Gospel of Peter and the Didascalia. (*The Academy*, June 24. 1893, p. 547.)

TAYLOR, C. Justin Martyr and the Gospel of Peter. (*The Classical Review*, June, 1893, p. 246-248.)

MARTINEAU, JAMES. The Gospel of Peter. (*The Nineteenth Century*, 1893: June, pp. 905-926; October, pp. 633-656.)

ROHRBACH, P. Zum Petrusevangelium. (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1893, Juni, S. 529-534.)

HILGENFELD, ADOLF. Zu dem Petrusevangelium. (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1893, Band II., Heft 1, S. 160).

Die neuaufgefundenen Petrusfragmente. I. Das Petrus evangelium. (*Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, 1893: Nr. 16, Sp. 401-404; Nr. 18, Sp. 449-451; Nr. 19, Sp. 473–474; Nr. 20, Sp. 500–501; Nr. 21, Sp. 521-523.)

BARNES, W. E. Canonical and uncanonical Gospels. With a translation of the recently discovered fragment of the Gospel of Peter, and a selection from the sayings of our Lord, not found in the four Gospels. London, 1893.

BADHAM, F. P. The Origin of the Peter Gospel. (*The Academy*, 1893, July 29, pp. 91–93; August 5, pp. 111–112.)

TYLER, THOMAS. "The Lord" in the Gospel of Peter. (*The Academy*, 1893: July 29, p. 94; September 30, pp. 275–276.)

HARRIS, J. RENDEL. The Structure of the Gospel of Peter. (*Contemporary Review*, August, 1893, pp. 212-236.)

HILGENFELD, ADOLF. Das Petrusevangelium. (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1893, Band II., Heft 2, S. 220-267.)

SCHUBERT, H. VON. (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Sept. 30, 1893, Sp. 498-504.) [A review of Kunze, Lundborg, and Völter.]

SCHUBERT, H. VON, The Gospel of St. Peter: Synoptical Tables with translations and critical apparatus. Authorized English translation by Rev. John Macpherson. Edinburgh, 1893.

JACQUIER, E. L'évangile selon St. Pierre. (*L'université catholique*, Sept., 1893, p. 5–29.)

BERNARD, J. H. The Gospel of Peter and Dionysius of Alexandria. (*The Academy*, Sept. 30, 1893, p. 275.)

ZOECKLER, O. Der echte und der gefälschte Petrus. (*Beweis des Glaubens*, Sept., 1893, Sp. 349-351.)

CHAPUIS, P. L'évangile et l'apocalypse de Pierre. I. (*Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, 1893, 4, p. 338-355.)

KUNZE, J. Das Petrusevangelium. I. (*Neue Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1893, Heft 4, Sp. 583-604.)

The Gospel of Peter. (*The Thinker*, Oct., 1893, pp. 359-362.)

CONYBEARE, F. C. Had Polycarp the Gospel of Peter in his hands? (*The Academy*: 1893, Oct. 21, pp. 343–344; Dec. 23, p. 568–569.)

LEGGE, F. Some Heretical Gospels. (*The Scottish Review*, 1893, pp. 133-162.)

WABNITZ, A. Les fragments de l'Évangile et de l'Apocalypse de Pierre. (*Revue de théologie et des questions relig.*, 1893, 6, p. 474-487.)

HEADLAM, ARTHUR C. The Akhmîm Fragments. I. The Gospel of Peter. II. The Apocalypse of Peter. (*Classical Review*, Dec., 1893, pp. 458-463.)

GARNETT, JAMES M. The Gospel of St. Peter, (*Protestant Episcopal Review*, Dec., 1893.)

SABATIER, A. L'Évangile de Pierre et les évangiles canoniques. Paris, 1893.[1]

[1] The foregoing Bibliography includes all the editions, translations and discussions known lower down to the close of 1893. Of book notices I have mentioned only such as contain an independent discussion of the Gospel itself or of questions connected with it.

APPENDIX.

[Reprint from the *New York Independent* of May 4 and 11, 1893.]

THE ALLEGED DOCETISM OF THE GOSPEL OF PETER.

By the Rev. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Ph.D.,
Professor of Church History in Lane Seminary, Cincinnati.

The majority of scholars that have expressed an opinion in regard to the recently published fragment of the lost Gospel of Peter seem to have taken its Docetism for granted, and many of them draw conclusions therefrom affecting prejudicially the antiquity and general character of the work. With these conclusions I am not here concerned, though I think it might be shown that such Docetism as the Gospel is alleged to contain is quite consistent with its early origin and with its use, for a time at least, even within orthodox circles. There are some facts, however, which do not seem to harmonize with the assumption that the Gospel is Docetic in its Christology, and which are significant enough to raise the question whether the common assumption may not be a mistake, or at least need some modification.

In support of the assertion that the Gospel is Docetic are urged, first, the statement of Serapion, quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi., 12, and secondly, two passages in the recovered fragment of the Gospel itself. Leaving the words of Serapion out of sight for the present, let us examine the passages in question. The first is in verse 10, where the manuscript reads *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐσιωπάσας μηδὲν πόνον ἔχων*. For the impossible *ἐσιωπάσας* Gebhardt, Lods, Robinson, Harnack, and many others read *ἐσιώπα ὡς*, which is doubtless correct. The sentence is then to be translated: "But he kept silence *as if* he were in nowise suffering pain." Whatever Docetism is supposed to lodge in the words *μηδὲν πόνον* is destroyed by the insertion of *ὡς*; and the sentence thus read is entirely in harmony with many statements in our Gospels which are not commonly regarded as Docetic—*e. g.*, Luke 4 : 30; John 4 : 32,

10 : 39—and indicates nothing more than a desire on the part of the author to emphasize the marvellous and heroic endurance of the sufferer. The same power of patient endurance is brought out in other ways by the Evangelist ; as, *e. g.*, in Mark 14 : 61, 15 : 5, 15 : 23. Had the author wished to indicate that the Lord really felt no bodily pain, he would certainly have stated it more plainly than he does.

The second passage which is supposed to reveal the Docetism of the Gospel is in verse 19 : *καὶ ὁ κύριος ἀνεβόησε λέγων ἡ δύναμις μου ἡ δύναμις κατέλειψάς με ; καὶ εἰπὼν ἀνελήφθη*—"And the Lord cried out, saying, Power, my Power, hast thou forsaken me? And when he had spoken he was taken up." The substitution of "Power" for "God," and of "was taken up" for "gave up the ghost," certainly looks suspicious, reminding us at once of that early and widely prevalent form of Docetism which taught that the Christ was distinct from the man Jesus, and descended upon him at baptism, leaving him again before his passion (or at the time of his death?). Compare, *e. g.*, Irenæus, i., 7 ; iii., 16, 17, 22, etc. But it is to be noticed that in the present passage it is not *Jesus* but the *Lord* that cries out "Power, my Power." If the author regarded *δύναμις* as the spiritual agent or the superior Christ (*ἄνω Χριστός*) that descended upon the man Jesus, he ought to have vindicated it by the use of the distinctive name *Ἰησούς* instead of the ambiguous *ὁ κύριος*, which certainly is not the word we should expect for the human as distinguished from the divine nature of the Saviour. But still more decisive is the fact that the subject of *ἀνεβόησε* and *ἀνελήφθη* is one and the same. It is the *Lord* that addresses the *δύναμις*, and it is the same *Lord* that is "taken up," *i. e.*, to Heaven, for *ἀνελήφθη* is the technical word for ascension (see Mark 16 : 19 ; Acts 1 : 2, 11, 22 ; 1 Tim. 3 : 16), and can mean here only "taken up to Heaven." But this is fatal to the assumption that our author draws the customary Docetic distinction between the human Jesus and the divine Christ, for such a distinction requires the *δύναμις* to be taken up, and the person addressing the *δύναμις* to remain dead upon the cross.

How then are we to explain the use of the word *δύναμις* instead of *θεός*, if the word is not to be taken in a Docetic sense? The sentence is a quotation from Ps. 22 : 2, where the Hebrew reads אֵלִי etc. ; but the Hebrew אֵל means *strength* or *power* as well as *God*, and in Ps. 22 : 2, is actually translated *ἰσχυρέ μου* by Aquila, though the LXX in the same passage has *θεός μου*. In the LXX of Neh. 5 : 5, the same word אֵל is translated *δύναμις ;* and Justin Martyr in his "Dialogue," c. 125, in explaining the word Israel makes the last syllable *-ηλ* mean *δύναμις*. Moreover, it is to be noticed that our Greek texts of Matthew and Mark in reproducing Christ's words give the Aramaic form first and then the Greek translation. It is quite possible, therefore, that our author, having the Hebrew or Aramaic form before him, translated by *δύναμις* instead of *θεός*, as he was quite at liberty to do. In thus translating he may have been unacquainted with the rendering of Matthew and Mark, or he may intentionally have departed from it. Certainly a man need not be Docetic in order to prefer to read *δύναμις ;* for it is not easy to think of the Saviour as forsaken by God in the hour of his trial.

So far as the word *ἀνελήφθη* is concerned, though it represents a different

conception from that expressed in Matthew and Mark, it yet agrees with Luke 23 : 43 : "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," and simply confirms what has long been known, that there was from the very beginning a diversity of opinion as to the abode of Christ's spirit during the period between his death and resurrection.[1]

The two passages, therefore, which are commonly supposed to exhibit the writer's Docetism are seen upon examination to be at best of doubtful significance, if they do not indeed actually prove the very opposite of that which they are alleged to prove.

But there are other passages in our fragment which throw light upon the question at issue, and which, therefore, demand attention.

The use of the phrase *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* in verses 6, 9, 45, and 46 is very significant. It is true that the phrase is found only in the mouth of Christ's enemies ; but a Docetic writer, interested to keep the suffering Jesus distinct from the impassible "Son of God," could hardly have permitted even them to use it in speaking of the former without in some way indicating that they were misapplying it. In fact, the impression left by the use of the phrase is that the author agrees with Matthew (26 : 63, 27 : 40, 43, 54) and Mark (15 : 39) in regarding it as quite legitimate.

Again it is to be noticed that throughout our fragment the word *κύριος* is used of Christ. It is *ὁ κύριος* that is brought to trial, that suffers indignities, that is crucified, that cries out in distress, that is "taken up," out of whose hands the nails are drawn, that is laid upon the earth, buried, rises again, and goes back "to the place from which he was sent." The acts both of humility and of glory are performed by the one *κύριος*. This alone is conclusive proof that the writer did not intend to exhibit the divine Christ as distinct from the man Jesus.

Again in verse 21 it is said that "they drew the nails out of the hands of *the Lord* and laid *him* upon the earth, and the whole earth quaked." No Docetic writer could in this artless way identify the *Lord* with the *body of the Lord* (*cf.* also verses 23 and 24, where the identification is even more striking) ; nor would such a writer be apt to connect the earthquake, as our author does, directly with the laying of the Lord's body upon the earth, thus going beyond the Synoptic Gospels in his emphasis upon the sacredness of that body. The passage might indeed be urged, with some plausibility, as evidence of an anti-Docetic interest on the part of the author. But the simple way in which the story is told leads rather to the conclusion that he writes without any polemic purpose. The same may be said also of verses 50–54.

Finally, in verses 56 and 57, it is said by the angel : "Whom seek ye ? Him that was crucified ? He has arisen and gone away. But if ye believe not, stoop down and see the place where he lay, because he is not here, for he has arisen and gone away to the place whence he was sent forth" (*ἀνέστη γὰρ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖ ὅθεν ἀπεστάλη*). The one "that was crucified" is here explicitly identified with the one "that has arisen," and then the crucified and

[1] Compare on this passage Harnack's *Bruchstücke d. Evangeliums und d. Apocalypse des Petrus*, p. 58 *sq.*

risen one is distinctly said to have "gone away to the place whence he was sent forth," which can mean no other place than Heaven, the presence of God who sent him forth. This passage not only confirms all that has been said of the identification by our author of Jesus and the Christ, but also indicates that in agreement with the Church at large he believed Christ's body as well as his spirit to have gone back to Heaven, and thus makes it clear that he did not accept even the subtler and less pronounced forms of Docetism taught by Apelles, and by the sect of Docetæ described by Hippolytus, *Phil.*, viii., 1–4. Apelles departed so far from the extreme Docetism of his master, Marcion, and of most of the Gnostics, and approached so near to the common faith of the Church, as to hold that the body assumed by the Christ actually arose from the grave, and that the Christ appeared in this body to his disciples after the resurrection. But he showed himself to be a Docetist in teaching that the body which Christ possessed was not a human body, but that it had a peculiar constitution of its own, being formed from the four elements—heat, cold, dryness, and moisture—and that after the resurrection his body was dissolved into these elements, and his spirit alone ascended to Heaven (*cf.* Hippolytus, *Phil.* vii., 26; Pseudo-Tertullian, *Adv. omnes Haer.* vi.; Epiphanius iv., 2; Philaster, *Haer.* 47). The Docetæ referred to by Hippolytus taught, on the other hand, that Christ possessed a human body, born of the Virgin, but that at his death he left this body nailed to the cross, and then, "that he might not be found naked," clothed himself in a spiritual body which he had received at the time of baptism, and that he took back to Heaven not that body which had been crucified, but only this spiritual body (see Hippolytus, *Phil.*, viii., 3).

II.

It thus seems that all signs, even of the least offensive forms of Docetism, are wanting in our fragment.

But what are we to do then with the account of Serapion? His words are as follows:

"For we, brethren, receive both Peter and the other Apostles as we do Christ; but we reject, as men of experience, the writings falsely ascribed to them, knowing that such were not handed down to us. For when I visited you I supposed that all of you held to the true faith, and as I had not read the Gospel, I said: If this is the only thing which occasions dispute among you, let it be read. But now, having learned from what has been told me that their mind was involved in some heresy, I will hasten to come to you again. Therefore, brethren, expect me shortly. But you will learn, brethren, from what has been written to you, that we perceived the nature of the heresy of Marcianus, and that, not understanding what he was saying, he contradicted himself. For, having obtained this very Gospel from others who were ascetics,[1] that is from the successors of those who introduced it, whom we call Docetæ (for most of their opinions are in agreement with the teaching of those men),[2]

[1] *παῤ ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων.* I have felt compelled to depart from the usual translation of this passage and to take *ἀσκησ·* intransitively in accordance with New Testament and Patristic usage.

[2] *τὰ λὰρ φρονήματα τὰ πλείονα ἐκείνων ἐστὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας.* The reason seems here to be given for calling these men Docetæ. They are so called by Serapion (it is to be noticed that

we were able to read it through, and we found most of it in accord with the true doctrine of the Saviour, but some precepts added,[1] which we have subjoined for you."

In considering the bearing of these words it must be remarked that the mere fact that the Gospel of Peter was used by certain heretics or by an heretical sect is no proof of its heretical character; for we know that our canonical Gospels were accepted by many of the leading heretics of the early Church, notably by Valentinus and his school. And it is worthy of note that Serapion does not say that these heretics to whom he refers were themselves the authors of the Gospel, or that they had made heretical emendations or additions. It is evident, however, that the Gospel did contain some things not found in our canonical Gospels which were used by the heretics in question to support their views.

But what were their views? The word Docetism as used by the Fathers commonly designates, not a distinct school or party, but simply an opinion or doctrine held by men of various parties. Only by Hippolytus and Clement of Alexandria is the name Docetæ applied to a special sect; Epiphanius, Philaster, and other anti-heretical writers knew of no such sect. The account of Hippolytus indicates that the sectaries with whom he was acquainted, and who gave themselves the name Docetæ, were Gnostic in much of their thinking, but held a doctrine of Christ's body much less Docetic than that of most of the Gnostics. Hippolytus does not know on what ground they are called Docetæ, and they certainly cannot have taken their name from their Christology which was so slightly Docetic and which was evidently so minor a part of their system. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, iii., 13) makes Julius Cassianus the founder of the sect of Docetæ; but that which attracts Clement's attention in connection with him is not his Docetism but his asceticism. Whether he was strongly Docetic we do not know; but Clement's reference is such as to lead us to think that his sect, like that described by Hippolytus, took its name from something else than its Christology.[2] Whether, therefore, the Christians to whom Serapion gives the name Docetæ are to be identified with those mentioned by Clement and Hippolytus or not, it is at least evident that the mere use of the name cannot be regarded as a proof that they were heretical in their Christology; and if we are to conclude that they were related to the other Docetæ it is more than probable that, whatever their Christology, it was not the determining, nor, indeed, a prominent feature of their system. In fact, Serapion's reference, in the passage quoted, to ascetics, and his use of the word

it is not said that they give the name to themselves) because their opinions agree with the opinions of a certain sect known as Docetæ. If this interpretation be doubtful, it is at least certain that *τὰ φρονήματα τὰ πλείονα* cannot be the "opinions of the Gospel of Peter," as commonly supposed; for Serapion says just below that most of *its* teachings are in accord with the true doctrine of the Saviour.

[1] *τινὰ δὲ προσδιασταλμένα.* As *διαστέλλω* in New Testament and Patristic Greek means "to command," the unusual word *προσδιαστέλλω* can hardly mean anything else than "to give additional commands."

[2] Whether Clement and Hippolytus are referring to the same or to different sects is not certain; Clement says nothing of the Gnostic speculation which Hippolytus describes at length, and Hippolytus does not refer to the asceticism of which Clement speaks.

διαστάλμένα in speaking of the additions which he found in the Gospel of Peter, seem to imply that the errors of the Christians of Rhossus lay not in the sphere of Christology, but in the sphere of practical life, and that it was an extreme or unhealthy asceticism which he was attacking. This would bring his Docetæ into line with those mentioned by Clement, and would also explain the fact that he does not condemn the Gospel in severe and sweeping terms, as he would be likely to do if it taught an heretical Christology—a subject upon which at this period, as a result of its conflict with Gnosticism, the Church was peculiarly sensitive. In fact, Serapion speaks very kindly of the Gospel, declaring its general truthfulness and finding fault with it, not because it contradicts the true doctrine at any point, but because it contains some unwarranted additions. The nature of these additions it is not difficult to guess. They consisted, doubtless, of utterances of Christ similar to that quoted by Cassianus and referred by Clement to the Gospel of the Egyptians—utterances more or less ascetic in their tendency; or of statements like that which Origen (in Matt. 10: 17) tells us the Gospel actually contained, namely, that the brethren of Christ were children of Joseph by a former wife, which was also turned to account by ascetics. Such extra-canonical passages might be numerous and yet not appear in the fragment which has been recovered. It is not probable that Serapion was referring to the additions found in the narrative of the resurrection; for a Father of the second century would hardly take offence at such pious exaggerations, all of which are very modest compared with the notions of his day, and none of which is harmful either to doctrine or practice.

This examination of Serapion's account confirms the conclusion drawn from our examination of the Gospel itself, that we are not warranted in accusing its author of holding Docetic views of Christ.

V

FAUST AND THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS

FAUST AND THE CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS.

By ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON, Ph.D.,
Librarian of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.

It is with hesitation that any one at this day adds to the appalling mass of Faust literature, but two facts have led to the present paper: 1. The exhaustive work of Kiesewetter[1] on the historical and traditional Faust, just published, and the equally interesting and exhaustive work of Faligan,[2] published in 1888, practically ignore the most plausible hypothesis of the very origin of this story. 2. There are two or three matters of undoubted pertinency which have not hitherto been brought to bear on the subject. The discussion of these will at least bring together lines which have been followed out too independently, and, with the addition of one or two facts and observations, will furnish a positive historical hypothesis which may hope to prove the solution.

On the 20th of August, 1507, Trithemius, Abbot of Spanheim, wrote to his friend, Johann Wirdung of Hassfurt, Court astrologer to the Elector Palatine, in reply to a request for information concerning one Georgius Sabellicus, who styled himself chief of necromancers ("principem necromanticorum"), and from whom the latter was eagerly expecting

[1] KIESEWETTER, CARL. *Faust in der Geschichte und Tradition.* Leipzig, 1893. 8vo.

[2] FALIGAN, ERNEST. *Histoire de la légende de Faust.* Paris, 1888. 8vo. Those who are curious to follow up the history of the Faust story will find here an exhaustive bibliographical list—the most comprehensive works being the collection of monographs in Scheible's Kloster, and the works of Ristelhuber, Faligan, and Kiesewetter.

a visit.[1] It appears from this letter that Trithemius had known of Sabellicus since May, 1505, and regarded him as a vagabond impostor, of execrable morals, who deserved the whipping-post. He gives details, founded "on most reliable authority," of the evil reputation which Sabellicus had acquired at Gelnhausen, at Würzburg, and at Kreuznach, and visits no little contempt and indignation on him for the title which he has framed for himself as suitably descriptive of his accomplishments. This title reads "Magister Georgius Sabellicus Faustus Junior, fons necromanticorum, astrologus, magus secundus, chiromanticus, agromanticus, in hydra arte secundus," and the "Faustus Junior," who appears here for the first time, is the historical starting-point of the familiar Faust story.

Passing by the document which relates to the presence of Faust at Heidelberg in 1509, the next document which is to the purpose of this paper is a letter of Mutianus Rufus, who, on the 7th of October, 1513, wrote to Urbanus that "eight days ago there came to Erfurt a Chiromant named Georgius Faustus, Helmitheus Hedebergensis," and speaks of him as a foolish impostor.[2]

From this point until 1587 allusions to Faustus, both by contemporaries and by those who knew him by reputation, are numerous. Among the former are Melanchthon, and perhaps Luther, Camerarius, Begardi, Gast, Gesner, and Wier. Among the latter are Bullinger and Lercheimer, with many others.

From all this testimony it appears that the historical Faust flourished from 1505 until about 1540, and was of great reputation, among learned and ignorant alike, as a reputed magician. After his death his reputation grew rather than diminished, and tales of other magicians gravitated to his name, until, in 1587, these tales were collected and, with various additions from sundry sources, published at Frankfort as *The History of Dr. John Faust.*

[1] For full text of this letter see documents at the end of this paper.

[2] For text see documents at end of paper.

If the reputation of the historical Faust was extraordinary, the popularity of this idealized Faust was almost unparalleled. In less than five years the book had spread all over Northern Europe. Not only were there numerous editions in the original High German, but translations had been made into Low German, Dutch, Flemish, Danish, and English at least, some of these passing through several editions in this time. These were followed in the succeeding years by new editions, translations into other languages from French to Lithuanian, redactions innumerable, and transformations in subject matter and literary form. Among the common people it gained and held a remarkable popularity, through ballads and puppet plays in great variety, down to the present time, while as a theme for literature, music, and art it has been welcomed from its first appearance. Marlowe's *Faustus* appeared shortly after the first Faust book itself, and afterwards Lessing, Heine, and, above all, Goethe found in him a worthy theme, and have made the name of Faust familiar to all students of literature. The latest dramatic form of the story (the play of Mr. Wills) has, through the acting of Mr. Irving, brought up to the present day the tradition of the perennial popularity of Faust. And what is true of literature and the stage is true also of art and music. Among earlier artists, Rembrandt, Jost Amman, and Ary Scheffer found him a suitable theme, while in recent years this same theme has become wellnigh hackneyed. In music he has been handled by Lindpaintner, Radziwill, and Spohr, and, through Berlioz and Gounod, has become a familiar image to every lover of music the world over. There is not, in the history of modern comparative literature, a figure so well known as that of Faust.

But the Fausts of Gounod, Goethe, and Wills are not the same Faust, nor have they, though the lineal descendants of the historical Faust, much in common with him. Lamb's familiar question, "What has Margaret to do with Faust?" might be asked of other things. Even the compact in blood and Mephisto do not belong to Faust before the Volksbuch. The Faust of to-day is an evolution, and has in common

with the founder of the race nothing but a name and a certain uncanny reputation.

On this very account, however, the problem with which this paper has to do—the origin of the name—is the more interesting. The whole story is one to delight the student of comparative literature. Its remarkable extent and popularity give an uncommon interest to every problem of its history, but the fact that the single enduring characteristic of the famous story lies in the name itself gives a peculiar interest. Moreover, the problem touches the very historical beginning. The story is traced with clearness back to the date 1505 and the person Faust. There, just as the student thinks to touch the goal, it suddenly recedes in an aggravating "Junior." Who is Faustus Senior? Without him the beautiful bit of critical literary history is a torso. He is the head of all.

It is not surprising that, in view of these facts, the attempts to solve the problem have been many (not to say desperate)—it is only surprising that there have not been more. One of these proposed solutions suggests that Faustus is his real family name, his father being thus Faustus Senior, while "Georgius Sabellicus" is only a *nom de guerre* taken on for his escapades, and borrowed from the Italian humanist, Marcus Antonius Sabellicus. This is both simple and ingenious, but will not stand. "Georgius Sabellicus" is the name given by Trithemius, and "Faustus Junior," according to our only source, is a part of the title which he assumed as appropriate to himself. "Faustus Junior" undoubtedly points to some well-known earlier magician, whose name would stand as representing magic art. But who? A popular guess says Fust the printer, but this guess rests on the now exploded legend that Fust the printer was arrested for magic. With Fust's magic vanishes his availability.

Some critics, with little ground and less acceptance, have proposed Faustus Socinus, and others have tried to make of the word only a descriptive term (fausta), meaning "lucky." A slightly more plausible hypothesis, and one

which has been received with favor, is that of Schwetschke ("Deutsches Museum, Oct. 11, 1855"), who calls attention to the career of Publius Faustus Andrelinus, an Italian, afterwards professor at the University of Paris, and the correspondent of Erasmus. This is at best, however, only a plausibility, and the grounds on which it is based relate chiefly to the Faust of 1587.

Still another Faustus is the one proposed by Herman Grimm,[1] who argues that the source for the episode of the visit of the old man is found in the *Confessions* of Augustine, and that Faustus, Bishop of the Manichæans, is the original Faustus. The refusal to allow Faust to marry is put in conjunction with the Manichæan renunciation of marriage, and certain Manichæan suggestions of the eternity of matter are thought to confirm the theory. This, like the preceding and like various following theories, relates to the Faust of 1587 rather than to the historical Faust, and the fact that the author of the Volksbuch used the *Confessions* of Augustine does not prove that the historical Faust of 1505 did. In fact the author himself does not make this confusion, and his argument relates solely to the Faust book of 1587.

Seven or eight years ago the writer of this paper, out of a list of some fifty famous Fausts before Faust, formed half a dozen theories of the original Faust, partly as a *reductio ad absurdum* of all theories founded on mere plausibility, or on a few points of similarity only. Faustus the Manichæan was the basis of one of these, and on similar, though somewhat differing grounds to those of Grimm, whose essay had not then been seen. Another Faust was Faustus of Byzantium, whom Faligan has since declared to be beyond suspicion. But, in his *History of Armenia*, does he not write of one who flew like a flash without difficulty through the air, who raised the dead, and "did many other wonders greater than these"? Then there is Fausta the prophetess of Pliny, with Pliny's tales of magic arts, and Faustulus the shepherd who found Romulus, and who, with his daughter

[1] Fünfzehn Essays, v. 3.

Helena, only a century before had been introduced anew to the people in Plutarch's life of Romulus.

These do not by any means exhaust the list of plausibilities, but they show two things: 1. That any examination must distinguish clearly between the historic Faust and the Faust of 1587. 2. That some definite historical or documentary link must be provided in order to establish any hypothesis.

Turning to the documents again, we note that Sabellicus called himself not only "Faustus Junior," but also "Magus secundus." Magus has been regarded by many as meaning simply "magician," in spite of the pointlessness of the "secundus" in this event. Others have rightly referred the word to Simon Magus. Among these latter is Grimm, who associates the legend of Simon's attempted flight through the air in the presence of Nero and its unfortunate result, with the reputed similar performance of the historic Faust at Venice, but, as before said, Grimm connects "Faustus" with Faustus the Manichæan. He thus derives "Magus" from Simon Magus, assuming, however, that there was no relation between Faustus and Simon Magus in the mind of Faustus Junior. But the contrary view has also been held. According to Faligan, Knauth relates that Simon Magus was received at Rome by Tiberius Claudius, and that the Emperor's sons, Faustus and Faustinus, were his pupils in magic. Thus Faustus, son of Tiberius and disciple of Simon Magus, he claims as Faustus Senior. Just where this item of history is found Knauth does not tell, and Faligan does not know, but the latter hazards the safe opinion that Faustus Junior did not get his name from this source. The relation of names is, however, striking, and, "if true," as M. Faligan remarks, "these pupils of Simon Magus would have been worthy to serve as patrons to Faust." It is not true, but it is true that in literary history another Faustus was pupil of Simon, and it is probable that Faustus Junior drew his name from this mythical pupil of Simon, to wit, Faustus, son of Faustinianus, brother of Faustinus and of Clement of Rome, who relates their adventures and his in the book of *Recognitions*.

In the prolegomena to his edition of the Clementines, published in 1865, Lagarde alluded to the resemblance between the old Clement-Simon Magus story and the modern Faust story, in respect of Faust, Helen, Justus, the Homunculus, and the magic tricks. In a review of the book in the *Studien und Kritiken* (1867) Steitz took up and enlarged on the matter. Since Lagarde and Steitz, the solution has been noticed here and there with approval, as by Erich Schmidt in the *Goethe Jahrbuch* for *1882*, by the Abbé Maistre in his *Life of St. Clement*, by H. Sutherland Edwards in the *Fortnightly Review*, and by various others. Dr. Schaff, in his Church history, has a note on the resemblances suggested by Lagarde and Steitz, and justly doubts "whether these resemblances are sufficient to establish a connection between the two otherwise widely divergent popular fictions." In fact, as has been remarked, mere general resemblances do not establish anything, and in this case the theory fails just where some of the others mentioned failed,—it proves too much. Helen, Justus, and the Homunculus belong to the Faust-book of 1587, and not to the Faustus of 1505–7. But omitting all these resemblances, the fact remains of a Faustus pupil of Simon Magus—an unquestionable literary-historical character, suitable as the senior to Faustus Junior.

And if mere suitability proves nothing where there is not at least historic probability, here it is different. Faligan says of Faustus of Byzantium and Knauth's Faust, that it is not probable they came under the view of Faustus Junior. The argument of Grimm for Faustus the Manichæan is founded on the probability that Augustine's *Confessions* would be familiar. If, in other words, to the extreme suitability of the Faustus of the *Recognitions* joined with Simon Magus as explanation of the Magus secundus be added a plausible probability that Faustus Junior was acquainted with the Clementine literature, it affords an historical probability amounting to proof that he derived his name from this source.

Here the argument of Steitz, though mistaken, has some-

thing to the point. According to him the various traditions and the name "flowed together" in the Faust legend. This view he grounds on the fact of the popularity of the *Recognitions* during the Middle Ages, a popularity which he infers from the large number of manuscripts mentioned by Lagarde. Now if the manuscripts mentioned by Lagarde, and which number fifteen, are a sufficient explanation of a widespread popular knowledge, then, *a fortiori*, the nearly hundred manuscripts known to the writer of this paper indicate such a degree of popularity that for it to be unknown to Georgius Sabellicus would be impossible.[1] Faustus Junior was a student. If a student of theology at Heidelberg, he would certainly have known the story, and at all events there would have been opportunities enough for any student, for South Germany, Switzerland, and Northern Italy with Eastern and Southern France were scattered thick with manuscripts. But more than that, just two years before the appearance of Faust, the first printed edition of the Clementine *Recognitions* was published.[2] And once again, and still more notable so far as the juxtaposition of Faustus and Simon is concerned, their story is found under the history of Clement in Voragine's "Golden Legend," the popularity of which was considered at length in a paper in the first volume of the Proceedings of this Society.[3] In brief, there are about three hundred manuscripts of this work in existence, and during the thirty years before the appearance of the historic Faust there were more than one hundred (one hundred and thirty) printed editions. It was the book of the common people, and its author quotes the *Recognitions* as his source. The story of Simon and Faustus was therefore freshly and prominently before both the learned world and the common people, and in speaking of himself as

[1] *Cf.* HARNACK. *Gesch. d. altchr. Litteratur*, i. (1893), 229–230.

[2] X. Februarii M.D. III is date of prefatory epistle. The *Paradysus Heraclidis*, included with the *Recognitions* is dated xxiii. Februarii of the same year, and the colophon of the *Recognitions* reads "Ex officinia Bellovisiana. Finis: Impensis Joannis Parvi. . . . . M.D. III. Idibus Iulliis, iullio secundo."

[3] Pp. 235–248, especially p. 240, *note*.

"Faustus Junior" and "Magus secundus" Sabellicus was referring to characters perfectly well understood by the men of his day.

Returning again to the documents, we note that the boasts of Faustus are echoes of those of Simon. Faustus is "princeps necromanticorum," and "fons necromanticorum"; Simon insists that he shall be regarded as chief of his company of magicians. Faustus is "agromanticus," or, as some correct, "aëromanticus"; Simon can make trees to grow up, bear leaves, and produce fruit in a moment, or, if the correction is accepted of "aëromanticus," then Simon can "fly through the air," "fly from mountain to mountain supported by angel's hands." Faustus is "pyromanticus"; Simon can "walk in fire" and "ignis commistus unum corpus effectus sum," and casting himself into the fire, is not burned. Again, Faust is necromancer and astrologer. In the *Recognitions* there is talk of necromancy, and much of astrology, the father of Faustus (or Faustus) being an astrologer. Finally, Faustus claimed to be able to do all the miracles of Christ whenever he wished, and "scire atque posse quiquid homines optaverint," while Simon is adored as God, sets himself above Christ, professes to do his miracles, and says that "in brief, whatever I wish to do, I can do!"

Passing to the testimony of Mutianus, I venture an observation which may or may not bear on the subject. According to Mutianus Rufus, Faustus is called "Helmitheus Hedebergensis." These words are, it is said, "unintelligible." All sorts of efforts have been made to decipher them, the only tolerable hypothesis being that of two typographical errors for "Hemitheus Hedelbergensis" or "the demi-god of Heidelberg." Now it may have no connection whatever with the matter, but it is curiously interesting that Helmitheus or Helmetheus occurs in some manuscripts and in the printed editions of the *Recognitions* as the name of a Greek god, the son of Pyrra and Prometheus, and, so far as appears, is not found elsewhere in all literature. It

Compare documents at end of paper.

is not wholly impossible that this student-magician, boasting so great familiarity with the Greek classics that he could reproduce from memory all of Plato and Aristotle, should have been struck by the name of this unique son of Prometheus, who had at the same time a good father for a magician, and a good alliterative name to be placed with Hedelbergensis. It is at least as likely as Hemitheus; for Faust was not at all likely to call himself a demi-god—he was above the Son of God and was not likely voluntarily to take second place to any god, whether heathen, Jewish, or Christian. The reason why Helmetheus is unique in the *Recognitions* is that he is a manuscript corruption for Hellen et Prometheus.[1]

But letting this pass for what it is, it appears from the preceding considerations that by himself Faustus, pupil of Simon Magus, is more probable than any other Faustus. It appears, in the second place, that the title "Magus secundus" identifies the Faust almost beyond a doubt, and compels the hypothesis that Faustus Junior must have known the Clementines in some form. When further it appears, from the vogue of the *Recognitions* and its derivatives in manuscripts, and the renewed attention which had just been drawn to it in print, that Faustus Junior must have been acquainted with it, this assurance is increased, and when to all this is added so considerable a body of resemblances in titles, assumptions, and circumstances, it becomes fairly certain that Faustus took his name and character from the *Recognitions*.[2]

With the relation of the Clementines to the Faust book of 1587 and later, this paper does not deal, except to note the

[1] This is altogether as pretty a piece of evolution through scribal errors as can well be imagined. The author originally declared that Pyrrha and Erymetheus were parents of Helen and Prometheus. This is gradually transformed until Pyrrha and Prometheus are parents of Helmitheus!

[2] It should be noted that most of the facts cited apply equally well to the Homilies or the Epitomes, but, unless some definite link is established, the probability rests with the *Recognitions*. Whichever form it was, the ultimate source is the same, and is found in the story of Clement, which dates from the second century.

fact that it is a separate problem. That there is connection between the book of 1587 and some form of the Clementine story is probable. This is suggested as early as 1599 by Widman, in his edition of the Faust-book. He speaks, however, of the Clementine *Recognitions*, of which several additional editions had already been published. The fact, however, that the Helena of the other forms is Selena, and translated Luna in the *Recognitions*, requires some other source—undoubtedly the Epitome published in 1555—but with this we do not deal.

DOCUMENTS.

Testimony of Trithemius.

(*Epp. fam. Hag.* 1536, repr. Kiesewetter, p. 4.)

Homo ille de quo mihi scripsisti Georgius Sabellicus, qui se principem necromanticorum ausus est nominare, gyrovagus, battologus, et circumcellis est, dignus qui verberibus castigetur, ne temere deinceps tam nefanda et ecclesiæ sanctæ contraria publice audeat profiteri. Quid enim sunt aliud tituli quos sibi assumit, nisi stultissimæ ac vesanæ mentis indicia, qui se fatuum, non philosophum ostendit? Sic enim titulum sibi convenientem formavit, Magister Georgius Sabellicus, Faustus junior, fons necromanticorum, astrologus, magus secundus, chiromanticus, agromanticus, pyromanticus, in hydra arte secundus. Vide stultam nominis temeritatem, quanta feratur insania, ut se fontem necromantiæ profiteri præsumat, qui vere omnium bonarum literarum ignarus fatuum se potius appellare debuisset quam Magistrum, sed me non latet ejus nequitia. Cum anno priore de Marchia Brandenburgensi redirem, hunc ipsum hominem apud Geilenhusen oppidum inveni; de quo mihi plura dicebantur in hospitio frivola, non sine magna ejus temeritate ab eo promissa. Qui mox, ut me adesse audivit, fugit de hospitio et a nullo poterat persauaderi, quod se meis præsentaret aspectibus. Titulum stulticiæ suæ qualem dedit ad te quem memoravimus, per quemdam civem ad me quoque destinavit. Referebant mihi quidam in oppido sacerdotes, quod in multorum presentia dixerit, tantam se omnis sapientiæ consecutum scienciam atque memoriam, ut, si volumina Platonis et Aristotelis omnia cum tota eorum philosophia in toto perîsset ab hominum memoria, ipse suo ingenio, velut Ezras alter Hebræus, restituere universa cum præstantiore valeret elegantia. Postea me Neometi existente Herbipolim venit, eademque vanitate actus, in plurimorum fertur dixisse præsentia, quod Christi Salvatoris miracula non sint miranda, se quoque omnia facere posse, quæ Christus fecit, quoties et quandocunque velit. In ultima quoque hujus anni quadragesima venit stauronesum, et simili stulticiæ gloriosus de se pollicebatur ingentia, dicens se in alchimia omnium qui fuerint unquam esse perfectissimum, et scire atque posse quidquid homines optaverint. Vacabat interea munus docendi scholasticum in oppido memorato, ad quod

Francisci ab Sickingen Balivi principis tui, hominis mysticarum rerum percupidi, promotione fuit assumptus; qui mox nefandissimo formationis genere, cum pueris videlicet voluptari cœpit, quo statim deducto in lucem fuga pœnam declimavit paratam. Hæc sunt quæ mihi certissimo constant testimonio de nomine illo quem tanto venturum desyderio præstolaris. Cum venerit ad te, non philosophum, sed hominem fatuum et nimia temeritate agitatum.

Testimony of Mutianus Rufus.

(*Epp.* 1701, repr. Kiesewetter, p. 6.)

Venit octavo abhinc die quidam Chiromanticus Erphurdiam, nomine Georgius Faustus, Helmitheus Hedebergensis, merus ostentator et fatuus. Ejus et omnium divinaculorum vana est professio, et talis physiognomia levior typula. Rudes admirantur. In eum theologi insurgant. Non conficiant philosophum Capnionem. Ego audivi garrientem in hospitio. Non castigavi jactantiam. Quid aliena insania ad me?

Extracts from the Clementine "Recognitions."

2 : 7. Simon hic, patre Antonio matre Rachel natus est, gente samaræus ex vico Gethonum, arte magus, Græcis itamen litteris liberalibus apprime eruditus, gloriæ ac jactantiæ supra omne genus hominum cupidus, ita ut excelsam virtutem quæ supra creatorum Deum sit credi se velit, et Christum putari atque Stantem nominari. . . . .

2 : 9. . . . . tantum ut mihi, inquit, Simoni deferatis primatus, qui possum magica arte multa signa et prodigia ostendere . . . . novas arbores subito oriri faciam . . . . et repentina virgulta producam, in ignem memetipsum injiciens non ardeam. Vultum meum commuto, ut non agnoscar, sed et duas facies habere me possum hominibus ostendere. Ovis aut capra efficiar, pueris parvis barbam producam, in ærem volando invehar, aurum plurimum ostendam, reges faciam eosque dejiciam. Adorabor ut Deus, publice divinis donabor honoribus, ita ut simulacrum mihi statuentes tanquam Deum colant et adorent. Et quid opus est multa dicere? quidquid voluero facere, potero.

3 : 47. Ego sum prima virtus, qui semper et sine initio sum. . . . . ego per ærem volavi, igni commistus unum corpus effectus sum, statuas moveri feci, animavi exanima, lapides panes feci, de monte in montem volavi, transmeavi manibus angelorum sustentatus ad terras descendi. Hæc non solum feci, sed et nune facere possum, ut rebus ipsis probem omnibus quia ego sum filius Dei stans in æternum, et credentes mihi similites stare in perpetuum faciam.

Faustinus Speaking for Himself aud for Faustus.

2 : 5. . . . . Niceta inquit . . . . Super hæc autem omnia et Simon vehementissimus est orator . . . . quod autem est omnibus gravius, et in arte magica valde exercitatus; . . . . dum adjutores ejus et errorum socii fumuis.

7 : 31. Tum Petrus : Nolo turberis, mulier, constans esto ; isti sunt Faustinus et Faustus filii tui . . . . et quemadmodum alius ipsorum Niceta et alius Aquila dicatur ipsi tibi exponere poterunt. . . . .

7 : 33. Simoni autem cuidam mago qui nobiscum una educatus est, pro amicitiis et puerili consuetudine adhæsimus ita ut pene ab eo decipi possemus. . . . . nos interim cum pene jam deciperemur a Simone quidam collega domini mei Petri, Zacchæus nomine, monuit ne falleremur a mago. . . . .

9 : 35. . . . . Gemini autem filii ejus sunt isti, Niceta et Aquila, quorum alius Faustinus vocabitur prius et alius Faustus. . . . .

9 : 36. Utque post hæc studiorum et consuetudinis causa Simoni adhæserint, atque ab eo, ubi magam et deceptorem viderunt, aversi accesserint ad Zacchæum. . . . .

VI

THE CONTEST FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN MASSACHUSETTS

THE CONTEST FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN MASSACHUSETTS.

By Rev. HENRY S. BURRAGE, D.D.,
Editor of *Zion's Advocate*, Portland, Me.

The General Court of Massachusetts, from the settlement of the Colony, in providing for the support of the Christian ministry, followed the ecclesiastical law which had been in force in England long before the Reformation, viz.: that every man should be taxed for this purpose in the town, parish, precinct, or district where he lived, unless specially exempt. In 1638, it was enacted that "every inhabitant who should not voluntarily contribute to all charges, both in Church and Commonwealth proportionately, according to his ability, should be compelled thereto by assessment."

In 1646, the General Court, while disclaiming the "lordship of human power on the faith and consciences of men," decreed that persons denying certain doctrines, among them the baptism of infants, should be banished if they continued "obstinate after due means used for their conviction."

The members of the General Court, as early as 1654, held it to be "their great duty to provide that all places and people within their gates should be supplied with an able and faithful minister of God's holy word"; and presidents of county courts and grand juries were to present all abuses and neglects, and give attention to the orders of the General Court concerning the maintenance of the ministry, etc.

By a majority of one vote, in October, 1658, the General Court of Massachusetts passed an order banishing both

visiting and resident Quakers upon pain of death if they returned. During the two years in which this law was in force, William Robinson, Marmaduke Stevenson, and Mary Dyer were executed on Boston Common.

By a special order, May 11, 1659, the county treasurers were authorized to sell Daniel and Provided Southwicke, son and daughter of Lawrence Southwicke, to any English people in Virginia or at Barbadoes, to satisfy fines imposed upon them "for siding with the Quakers and absenting themselves from the public ordinances."

The first Baptist Church in Boston was organized May 28, 1665, and in May, 1668, Thomas Gould, William Turner, and John Farnum, as "obstinate and turbulent Anabaptists," who had "combined themselves with others in a pretended church estate without the knowledge and approbation of the authority here established to the great grief and offence of the godly orthodox," were ordered by the General Court to remove themselves out of the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, or be committed to prison; and they chose the latter alternative.

May 15, 1672, the General Court, in a revision of the Colonial laws, enacted "that if any Christian within this jurisdiction" shall, among other things, "openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of that ordinance, or shall deny the ordinance of magistracy, or their lawful authority to make war or to punish the outward breaches of the first table . . . every such person continuing obstinate therein, after due means of conviction, shall be sentenced to banishment.[1]

[1] This action of the General Court recalls the sentence of banishment decreed against Roger Williams, Oct. 19, 1635. It is pleasant to know that on account of Roger Williams' valuable services to the Massachusetts colonists, this sentence, was revoked by the Council, March 31, 1676. The revocation is in these words: "Whereas Mr. Roger Williams stands at present under a sentence of Restraint from coming into this Colony, yet considering how readyly and freely at all tymes he hath served the English Interest in this time of warre with the Indians and manifested his particular respects to the Authority of this Colony in several services desired of him and further under-

There were other similar enactments of the General Court during this period, but these represent the general drift of legislation with reference to those who dissented from the ecclesiastical establishment of Massachusetts.

The second charter of the Colony, which was dated Oct. 7, 1691, allowed equal liberty of conscience to all Christians except Roman Catholics. October 12, 1692, however, the General Court, continuing in the course already pursued, enacted a law requiring each town to have a minister, for whose support the inhabitants of the town should be taxed, "each man his several proportion thereof." This law was subsequently somewhat modified, but its principal features remained unchanged, and in 1718, the General Court authorized also the imposition of a tax for the building and repairing of parish meeting-houses.

Baptists, especially as they came to have churches of their own, also Episcopalians and Quakers, objected to these parish taxes. The first exemption act was passed in 1727, and had reference to members of Episcopal churches only. By an act passed in May, 1728, Baptists and Quakers were

standing how by the last assault of the Indians upon Providence his House is burned and himself in his old age reduced to an uncomfortable and disabled state. Out of Compassion to him in this Condition The Council doe Order and Declare that if the sayed Mr. Williams shall see cause and desire it he shall have liberty to repayre into any of our Towns for his security and comfortable abode during these Public Troubles, He behaving himself peaceably and inoffensibly and not disseminating and venting of his different opinions in matters of Religion to the dissatisfaction of any." Roger Williams died in 1683; but although in the seven years of life that remained he did not avail himself of this manifestation of "Compassion," he could not have been insensible to the kindly feeling that prompted it. This revocation has been overlooked by historians until recently. Dr. H. M. Dexter, when he published his *As to Roger Williams*, did not refer to it and evidently had not seen it. When the "Acts of the Commissioners of the United Colonies of New England" were published in 1859 (*Plymouth Colony Records*, vol. x.), the editor, to render the work more perfect, added in an appendix several acts and minutes of the Commissioners and other documents, "discovered since the printing of this volume was commenced." The above revocation of the sentence of banishment against Roger Williams was one of these documents, but for some reason it was inserted in the Introduction, and was overlooked by the person who prepared the index. See *Plymouth Colony Records*, vol. x., p. vi., Introduction; also, as to its original source *Massachusetts Archives*, vol. x., p. 233.

also exempted from parish taxes, provided they "usually attend the meetings of their respective societies, assembling upon the Lord's day for the worship of God, and that they live within five miles of the place of such meeting." In December, 1731, the General Court passed a modified act with reference to the Quakers, omitting, among other provisions, the five-mile limitation. The Baptist exemption act expired in 1733, and the Baptists in Rehoboth were at once taxed for the support of the established ministry, and some of the members of the church who refused to pay the tax were imprisoned. Upon their application to the General Court, however, they were released, and a law like that enacted for the Quakers was passed for the relief of the Baptists. This law expired in 1747, and was then continued for ten years.

The testimony of Henry Fisk, an elder of the Baptist Church in Sturbridge, illustrates the oppressive treatment to which the Baptists in some parts of Massachusetts were still subjected.

"One brother was called from us and ordained a pastor of a Baptist church, and came for his family; at which time they seized him and drew him away, and thrust him into prison, where he was kept in the cold winter till somebody paid his fine and let him out. A. Bloice had a spinning wheel taken away in 1750, and was imprisoned in 1751; D. Fisk had five pewter plates taken from him in 1750, and a cow in 1751; John Cory imprisoned 1750; J. Barslow imprisoned 1750; J. Pike, a cow taken, 1750; a cradle in 1750 and a steer in 1751 were taken from J. Perry; trammel and irons, shovel and tongs were taken from J. Blunt in 1750, and he was imprisoned the next year. John Streeter had goods taken in 1750 and 1751; Benjamin Robbins, household goods and carpenter's tools; household goods and a cow were taken from H. Fisk in 1750 and 1751; Josiah Perry was imprisoned in 1750, and a cow taken from him in 1751; Nathaniel Smith was imprisoned in 1750; David Morse was imprisoned and a cow taken away in 1750, and a yoke of oxen in 1751; goods were taken from Phinehas Collier in 1750 and 1751; John Newel, goods taken in 1750 and 1751; John Draper imprisoned, 1751."

The town collectors in Sturbridge for 1750 and 1751 were presented on account of these many oppressive acts, and when one of the cases came to the Supreme Court by agreement it was referred to the judges, who gave judgment in favor of the Baptists. Then the collectors turned round and asked the town to indemnify them for their expenses in the case, and as the request was granted the Baptists in Sturbridge were compelled to bear their share of the bill which the collectors had incurred in defending their unlawful acts.

In 1752 the General Court enacted a law that no minister or church should have the power to give exemption certificates until there should be obtained "from three other churches, commonly called Anabaptists, in this or the neighboring provinces, a certificate from each respectively that they esteem such church to be of their denomination, and that they conscientiously believe them to be Anabaptists."

This action of the General Court was regarded by the Baptists as so unjust that they resolved to carry their case to England. Several meetings were held in 1753 and in 1754, and money was subscribed for this purpose. Furthermore, a remonstrance against these oppressive proceedings was presented to the General Court in May, 1754. This so enraged some of the members that a motion was made to arrest the signers of the remonstrance. Governor Shirley, however, convinced them of the folly of such a course, and a committee was appointed for a friendly conference with the Baptists. In 1757 the laws for exempting Baptists and Quakers expired, and a new law was enacted by which none were to be exempted from ministerial taxes as Baptists except those whose names should be "contained in a list or lists, to be taken and exhibited on or before the 20th of July annually to the assessors of such towns, district, precinct, or parish, and signed by three principal members of the Anabaptist church to which he or they belong, and the minister thereof, if any there be, who shall therein certify that the persons whose names are inserted in the said list or lists are really belonging thereto, that they verily believe them to be conscientiously of their persuasion, and that they

frequently and usually attend public worship in said church on the Lord's days." This law remained in force thirteen years. "No tongue or pen," says Mr. Backus, "can fully describe all the evils that were practised under it."

The Warren Association, with which the Baptist churches in Massachusetts were connected, very early took these matters into consideration. At the meeting in 1769, "many letters from the churches mentioned grievous oppressions and persecutions from the Standing Order; especially the one from Ashfield, where religious tyranny had been carried to great lengths." Accordingly a committee was appointed to draft petitions to the General Court of Massachusetts and Connecticut for redress. The following "plan to collect grievances" was also adopted :

"Whereas complaints of oppression occasioned by a non-conformity to the religious establishment in New England have been brought to this Association, and whereas the laws obtained for preventing and repressing such oppressions have, upon trial, been found insufficient (either through defect in the laws themselves, or iniquity in the execution thereof), and whereas humble remonstrances and petitions have not been duly regarded, but the same oppressive measures continued; This is to inform all the oppressed Baptists in New England that the Association of Warren (in conjunction with the Western or Philadelphia Association) is determined to seek remedy for these brethren where a speedy and effectual one can be had."

The following were appointed a committee to receive "well-attested grievances" to be by them transmitted to Rev. Samuel Stillman, Boston, viz.: Rev. Hezekiah Smith, of Haverhill; Rev. Isaac Backus, of Middleboro; Mr. Richard Montague, of Sunderland; Rev. Joseph Meacham, of Enfield, and Rev. Timothy Wightman, of Groton, Conn. At the meeting of the Association in 1770 it was unanimously resolved to send "to the British Court for help if it could not be obtained in America," and when the General Court of Massachusetts assembled the Baptist Committee of Grievances addressed to the General Court a petition in

which they referred to the ill-treatment they had received hitherto, and urged relief from the persecutions to which the Baptists were subjected.

As the old exemption law had expired, a new law was now passed; but notwithstanding the changes made its provisions were wholly unsatisfactory to the Baptists. When the Warren Association met in September, 1772, another Committee on Grievances was appointed with Mr. Backus as chairman, a position he held for ten successive years. He at once prepared an address to the public in which the case of the Baptists was fully and forcibly stated. In 1774 he addressed a letter to Samuel Adams, in which he said:

"I fully agree with your grand maxim that it is essential to liberty that representation and taxation go together. Well, then, since people do not vote for representatives in our Legislature from ecclesiastical qualifications, but only by virtue of those which are of a civil and worldly nature, how can representatives thus chosen have any right to impose ecclesiastical taxes? Yet they have assumed and long exercised such a power. . . . Two thousand dollars will not make good the damages that the Baptists of this Province have sustained within these ten years by being taxed to the other party, and by suing for their rights before judges and jurors who were of that party."[1]

Not long after this letter was written Mr. Backus received information that eighteen members of the Baptist church in Royalston, who had presented their certificates according to law, had been arrested and lodged in Northampton jail for declining to pay their ministerial rates. Mr. Backus at once petitioned the General Court in their behalf, asking that the men should be set at liberty, and that effective methods should be taken for the protection of the rights of all good members of civil society. As a result an act more favorable to the Baptists was passed by both branches of the General Court, but it failed to reach the Governor.

The opposition to British oppression had culminated in

[1] Hovey. *Life and Times of Isaac Backus*, pp. 196, 197.

the call for a meeting of representatives of the Colonies in Philadelphia, September 5, 1774, and the Warren Association requested Mr Backus to attend, and call the attention of the members of that body to the importance of securing religious as well as civil liberty. A conference was arranged at which there were present: Thomas Cushing, Samuel Adams, John Adams, and Robert Treat Paine, of Massachusetts; Stephen Hopkins and Samuel Ward, of Rhode Island, and other members of the Provincial Congress, also President Manning, of Rhode Island College, now Brown University, Dr. Gano, and others. President Manning presented a memorial in behalf of the Baptists of Massachusetts, calling attention to the oppressive laws enacted in that province against the Baptists, with illustrations of the way in which these laws were enforced. The Baptist position was clearly stated:

"To give laws, to receive obedience, to compel with the sword, belong to none but the civil magistrate; and on this ground we affirm that the magistrate's power extends not to the establishing any article of faith or forms of worship by force of law; for laws are of no force without penalties. The care of souls cannot belong to the civil magistrate, because his power consists only in outward force; but pure and saving religion consists in the inward persuasion of the mind, without which nothing can be acceptable to God. . . . As the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, and religion is a concern between God and the soul with which no human authority can intermeddle, consistently with the principles of Christianity, and according to the dictates of Protestantism, we claim and expect the liberty of worshipping God according to our consciences, not being obliged to support a ministry we cannot attend, whilst we demean ourselves as faithful subjects."[1]

The Adamses and other delegates from Massachusetts attempted to show that the Baptists complained without reason. Samuel Adams intimated "that the complaints came from enthusiasts who made it a merit to suffer persecution." But Mr. Backus and other Baptists present offered evidence

[1] Hovey. *Life and Times of Isaac Backus*, pp. 203–210.

in proof of their statements. In the course of the discussion John Adams said that one might as well expect a change in the solar system as that the great Puritan Commonwealth would abolish its ecclesiastical laws. There were those at this conference, however, who promised to do what they could for the relief of the Baptists; but although Mr. Backus and his associates were not inclined to attach much weight to this promise, before they left Philadelphia they placed a copy of President Manning's "Memorial" and a copy of Mr. Backus' "Appeal" in the hands of each delegate.[1]

It was subsequently reported by the opponents of the Baptists that Mr. Backus went to Philadelphia to oppose the movement for uniting the Colonies in defence of their liberties; in a word that they were willing to imperil the greater interests of the people by making prominent their denominational grievances. In a memorial to the Provincial Congress, which met in Cambridge in December, 1774, the members of the Baptist Committee on Grievances, through Mr. Backus, repudiated this suggestion. "The Baptist churches in this Province," they said, "as heartily unite with their countrymen in this cause as any denomination in the land; and are as ready to exert all their abilities to defend it." But they denied the right of the General Court to impose upon Baptists the burden of a ministerial tax, as they denied the right of the British Government to impose upon the colonists the tea tax.

To this memorial the Provincial Congress responded as follows:

"Resolved, That the establishment of civil and religious liberty, to each denomination in the province, is the sincere wish of this Congress. But being by no means vested with powers of civil government whereby they can redress the grievances of any person whatever, they therefore recommend to the Baptist churches, that when a General Assem-

[1] Backus, *History of the Baptists in New England*, vol. ii., p. 202, note. See also Hovey, *Life and Times of Isaac Backus*, pp. 203–215, 349–351; *Works of John Adams*, vol. ii., pp. 397–399; and Guild, *Manning and Brown University*, pp. 237–239.

bly shall be convened in this Colony, they lay the real grievances of said churches before the same, when and where their petition will most certainly meet with all that attention due to the memorial, of a denomination of Christians so well disposed to the public weal of their country."

The General Court met at Watertown, Sept. 20, 1775, and Mr. Backus, in accordance with this recommendation, sent in a memorial in which the Baptist position was vigorously stated. "Our real grievances," said the memorial, "are, that we, as well as our fathers, have, from time to time, been taxed on religious accounts where we were not represented; and when we have sued for our rights, our causes have been tried by interested judges. That the representatives in former assemblies, as well as the present, were elected by virtue only of civil and worldly qualities, is a truth so evident, that we presume it need not be proved to this assembly; and for a civil Legislature to impose religious taxes, is, we conceive, a power which their constituents never had to give." This memorial was referred to a committee of seven, of whom three were Baptists. On the report of this committee it was ordered that Dr. Fletcher, who was one of the Baptist members of the committee, have liberty to bring in a bill for the redress of such grievances as he apprehends the Baptists labor under. He brought in such a bill, and the bill was read once, but "other business was crowded in," says Mr. Backus, and no action followed.

These matters received attention at the meeting of the Warren Association at Grafton, Mass., Sept. 10 and 11, 1776, and a statement with reference to the Baptist position concerning religious liberty was adopted. At the meeting of the Association in 1777, Mr. Backus read an "Address to the People of New England," in which the whole matter was discussed. At the meeting in 1778, he read a paper on the same subject. This, like the address of the preceding year, was published and widely circulated.

In Massachusetts at this time the formation of a State constitution was under consideration. As early as 1776, a proposition was made in the General Court that a committee

should be appointed to prepare a form of government. Objection was made that such a matter should originate with the people, and the House recommended that deputies to the next General Court should be elected with power to frame, in connection with the Council, a form of government for the State. This was done, and at the next session a committee, consisting of four members of the Council and eight members of the House, was appointed to prepare a constitution. The draft of a constitution, prepared by this committee, was approved early in 1778, and submitted to the people. The XXXIVth Article of this constitution was as follows: "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed to every denomination of Protestants within the State." Another article, however, declared existing laws to be in full force until altered or repealed by a future law or laws of the legislature; and the Baptists of Massachusetts, insisting upon the insertion of a Bill of Rights, united with those who for other reasons were opposed to the new constitution, and it was rejected by a large majority, the citizens of Boston voting unanimously against its adoption.

It was evident that the people generally considered a convention as the proper body for the framing of a constitution, and such a convention was called to meet in Cambridge September 1, 1779. "Well might it be said," observes Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, "that to this convention were returned, from all parts of the Commonwealth, as great a number of men of learning, talent, and patriotism as had ever been assembled here at any earlier period." A committee of twenty-six was chosen to draft a constitution, and the convention soon adjourned to meet again October 28th. The proposed draft, which had been prepared by John Adams, was submitted at that time. The third article of the Bill of Rights, which formed the first part of the constitution, was as follows:

"Good morals being necessary to the preservation of civil society, and the knowledge and belief of the being of God, his providential government of the world, and of a future

state of rewards and punishment, being the only true foundation of morality, the legislature hath therefore a right, and ought to provide at the expense of the subject, if necessary, a suitable support for the public worship of God, and of the teachers of religion and morals; and to enjoin upon all the subjects an attendance upon their instructions, at stated times and seasons; provided there be any such teacher, on whose ministry they can conscientiously and conveniently attend.

"All monies, paid by the subject to the support of public worship, and of the instructors in religion and morals, shall, if he requires it, be uniformly applied to the support of the teacher or teachers of his own religious denomination, if there be such whose ministry he attends upon; otherwise it may be paid to the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct where he usually resides."

This article led to considerable discussion at the outset. The statement in its first paragraph, that the Legislature had the right "and ought to provide at the expense of the subject, if necessary, a suitable support for the public worship of God," was one which the Baptists of Massachusetts could not endorse. They were represented in the convention; and while this article was under consideration, some amendments having been proposed, Rev. Noah Alden, pastor of the Baptist church in Bellingham, moved "that a committee be appointed to consider of the proposed amendments of the said article as offered for the consideration of the convention and report thereon." The motion was carried, and Mr. Alden was made chairman of the committee, which consisted of seven members, five of whom, according to Mr. Backus, were "great politicians," viz.: Hon. Timothy Danielson, Theophilus Parsons, Esq., Hon. Samuel Adams, Hon. Robert Treat Paine, and Caleb Strong. The remaining member of the committee, aside from Mr. Alden, was Rev. David Sanford, pastor of the Congregational church in Medway, who appears in the printed roll of members in the "Proceedings" of the convention, as "Rev. Daniel Stanford, Medway."

Three days later this committee reported a new draft of the third article. This was "read repeatedly," and an ex-

tended debate followed. The debate is not reported in the journal of the proceedings of the convention. We are informed only that after discussion it was moved that "the third article in the Declaration of Rights, with all the amendments, be expunged." This motion, however, did not prevail. The report was then taken up "by propositions, and debated. The whole report, with the amendments, was finally accepted, and was substituted for the original article prepared by Mr. Adams. The new article was as follows:

"As the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality; and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion, and morality; therefore, to promote their happiness, and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily.

"And the people of this Commonwealth have also a right to, and do, invest their legislature with authority to enjoin upon all the subjects an attendance upon the instructions of the public teachers aforesaid, at stated times and seasons, if there be any whose instructions they can conscientiously and conveniently attend.

"Provided, notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.

"And all moneys paid by the subject to the support of public worship, and of the public teachers aforesaid, shall, if he require it, be uniformly applied to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any on whose instructions

he attends; otherwise it may be paid towards the support of the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct in which the said moneys are raised.

"And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good subjects of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

This article, which took the place of that drafted by John Adams, did not express Mr. Alden's long cherished convictions with reference to religious liberty. It was more satisfactory, however, than the article which Mr. Adams prepared. That asserted the right and the duty of the legislature "to provide, at the expense of the subject, if necessary, a suitable support for the public worship of God, and of the teachers of religion and morals." The substitute withheld this authority from the legislature, and asserted the right and duty of the legislature to authorize and require the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God. This was a concession to the Baptists. In towns where the Baptists were in the majority, the Baptists could elect one of their own number as minister of the town. This, however, was not the religious liberty for which the Baptists of Massachusetts had long lifted up their voices. As Backus said, the third article of the Bill of Rights gave to the majority in each town, parish, etc., the exclusive right of covenanting for the minority as to religious teachers, and so excluded the minority from the liberty of choosing for themselves in that respect. Baptists also complained inasmuch as individuals who wished to join them, but were connected with other societies, could not do so without applying for a special license,—an arrangement which they regarded as particularly oppressive, as well as inconsistent with natural rights.

When the work of the convention was finished, copies of the proposed Constitution were sent to the selectmen

of each town in the State, in order that the Constitution might be submitted to the people. The votes of the people, for or against the Constitution, were to be returned on the first Wednesday in June, 1780. At that date it appeared from the returns of the towns that more than two thirds of the votes were in favor of the Constitution, and the convention was dissolved June 16th.

Mr. Backus, in April, had published an appeal to the people of Massachusetts, presenting the objections of the Baptists to the proposed Constitution; and when the Warren Association met at Royalston, September 13th, a protest against the power claimed in the third article of the Bill of Rights was prepared and received the signatures of the delegates. When the General Court met in October this protest was presented, but the article was retained, and the Baptists of Massachusetts were compelled to continue the struggle in which they had been so long engaged.

The old difficulties at once reappeared. In 1781, the east parish of Attleborough assessed ministerial taxes upon several persons who attended worship elsewhere. One of the parties, Mr. Elijah Balkom, who was seized for his tax, sued the assessors for damages before a justice of the peace. As judgment was given against him, he appealed to the county court. Mr. Balkom was represented by counsel. The Attorney General of the State, Robert Treat Paine, appeared for the parish, but the judges unanimously gave to the appellant both damages and costs. Notwithstanding this decision, the annoyances of the Baptists continued. In 1781, a Baptist church was organized in Menatomy parish, Cambridge, now Arlington; and although a pastor was secured in 1783, the members of the church were taxed for the support of Congregational ministers, and in 1784 three were imprisoned. They accordingly sued the assessors, and at the county court in September, 1785, judgment was given in their favor. At the Superior Court in the following month, however, this decision was reversed. It was now suggested to the Baptists by an eminent lawyer, that if they would give the ruling sect certificates that they

belonged to a Baptist society, and desired that their ministerial tax should be given to the Baptist minister, it could be secured by a suit. Mr. Backus was not in favor of such a procedure. He regarded the giving of a certificate as an improper submission to the civil power in religious concerns, and he would not abandon the position he had so strenuously held hitherto. The Cambridge Baptists, however, followed the advice of their counsel, and "sued the money out of the hands of their oppressors until they left off collecting such money." This was done also in other places.

The Constitution of the United States, adopted by the Constitutional Convention, was submitted to the several States for ratification September 17, 1787. Its only provision concerning religion was the sixth article: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." This did not meet the wishes of the Baptists, who desired that the Constitution should contain a sufficient guarantee of religious liberty. Mr. Backus at first was among those who were strenuous in their opposition to the Federal Constitution on this account; but while in attendance upon the convention of which he was a member, receiving "much more light" on the matter, he, with Dr. Stillman of Boston, voted for the Constitution, closing a speech in its favor with these words: "Such a door is now opened, for the establishment of righteous government, and for securing equal liberty, as never was before opened to any people upon earth." The Constitution was adopted by a vote of 187 yeas to 168 nays. President Manning of Brown University was present when the vote was taken, and by invitation of Governor Hancock, and doubtless as a recognition of Mr. Manning's services in bringing about this result, Mr. Manning was asked to "close the solemn convocation with thanksgiving and prayer." Dropping upon his knees, he "poured out his heart in a strain of exalted patriotism and fervid devotion, which awakened in the Assembly a mingled sentiment of admiration and awe." The "much

more light" which Mr. Backus received may have been an intimation concerning an amendment to the Constitution, which was proposed in the following year, viz: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," etc. This amendment was adopted by the several States, and the Baptist doctrine of soul liberty became a part of the organic law of the new nation.

But here and there in Massachusetts the Baptists were still reminded of the experiences of earlier days. In 1799, however, a law was enacted which allowed the ministers of "other churches" to recover of the town treasurers, by petition or suit, the sums paid for the support of the Gospel by persons in attendance upon their instructions. In 1811, in a suit for money thus paid, Chief Justice Parsons decided that no society, except one incorporated by law, was entitled to this drawback. A petition signed by Rev. Thomas Baldwin, D.D., a well known Baptist minister in Boston, and many thousands of the citizens of the State of almost every denomination, — Methodists and Universalists, especially as they became more numerous, taking the same position as the Baptists,—was presented to the Legislature, in which, after a statement of facts, a request was made that the several existing laws respecting the worship of God should be "so revised and amended that all denominations of Christians may be exempt from being taxed to the support of religious teachers, excepting those whose ministrations they voluntarily attend." The matter was the occasion of an animated and lengthy discussion, and in June, 1811, a law was passed providing that whenever any person shall become a member of any religious society, incorporate or unincorporate, and shall produce a certificate of such membership to the clerk of the town where he resides, signed by a committee of the Society chosen for the purpose, such person shall ever afterwards, so long as he continues such membership, be exempted from taxation for the support of public worship and public teachers of religion, in every other religious corporation whatsoever. This act was

called the "religious freedom act." It was not satisfactory to the Baptists, however, as it retained the odious certificate system; yet it afforded relief from the oppressions they had so long endured.

In 1820, a convention was held for the purpose of revising the Constitution of Massachusetts. Among the members of the convention were Rev. Thomas Baldwin, D.D., of Boston, Rev. N. W. Williams, of Beverly, Hon. Heman Lincoln, of Boston, and other Baptists, who hoped that something might be done to eradicate from the Bill of Rights those provisions that had proved so troublesome and oppressive. The discussion with reference to the third article was a protracted one. The changes proposed by the committee of the convention were not approved by the Baptists. Dr. Baldwin and Mr. Williams stated the Baptist position clearly and forcibly. To the fourth resolution of the committee Mr. Williams offered the following amendment:

"Resolved that every religious society, incorporated or not incorporated, shall have power to raise moneys for the support of their respective teachers, and incidental expenses in such manner as they shall determine by the vote of a majority of the legal voters assembled at any meeting, warned and held according to law. And every person shall have and enjoy the full liberty of uniting with, and paying to the support of whatever religious society he may choose, in which the public worship of God shall be maintained, whether incorporated or not; provided he usually attends public worship therein, and contributes towards the expenses thereof; and every person neglecting to unite himself with some religious society for the purposes aforesaid, shall be liable to be taxed for the support of public worship in the parish or precinct in which he may reside. And every denomination of Christians demeaning themselves peaceably as good subjects of the Commonwealth shall be equally under the protection of the law. And no subordination of any one sect or denomination shall ever be established by law."

Daniel Webster, who was a member of the convention, opposed Mr. Williams' amendment. He was content with

the Constitution as it was, he said. The amendment would render the whole article a dead letter. Mr. Williams was consistent, he added, for "he wished the whole article done away." Mr. Williams' amendment was barely defeated, however. The vote was 179 to 186.

The amendments adopted by the convention were defeated by the people. The vote on these amendments to the Bill of Rights was 11,065 to 19,547—a majority in the negative of 8,482. The convention had failed to meet the wishes of the people. What the convention neglected to do, however, was done by the Legislature a few years afterwards, when, during the session of 1832–33, in response to a large number of petitions, in place of the third article of the Bill of Rights the following was adopted; and November 11, 1833, it was approved and ratified by the people as the eleventh amendment to the Constitution:

"As the public worship of God and instructions in piety, religion, and morality, promote the happiness and prosperity of a people, and the securing of a republican government; therefore, the several religious societies of this Commonwealth, whether incorporated or unincorporated, at any meeting legally warned and holden for that purpose, shall ever have the right to elect their pastors or religious teachers, to contract with them for their support, to raise money for erecting and repairing houses of public worship, for the maintenance of religious instruction, and for the payment of necessary expenses; and all persons belonging to any religious society shall be taken and held to be members until they shall file with the clerk of such society a written notice, declaring the dissolution of their membership, and thenceforth shall not be liable for any grant or contract which may be thereafter made, or entered into by such society; and all religious sects and denominations demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good citizens of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

The services of the Baptists of Massachusetts in securing this complete separation of Church and State are certainly worthy of record. Rev. John S. Clark, D.D., in his *Congre-*

gational Churches in Massachusetts, referring to the struggle occasioned by the third article of the Bill of Rights, says: "Conceding to the framers of that article all honesty of intention and purity of motive, we must also concede to our Baptist brethren the credit of holding the truth on that point—a very great and practical truth, which has since been acknowledged by the nearly unanimous action of the Commonwealth in expunging that article, and leaving religion to its own inherent, vital energy, with the promised blessing of God, for its support and propagation."

VII

THE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THE DOCTRINE OF APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By HENRY C. VEDDER, New York City.

A definition of terms is essential at the outset of this investigation, but I am not aware of a definition of Apostolic Succession that would be accepted as authoritative by those who profess the doctrine,[1] In this paper the term will be held to mean the doctrine that the order of bishops exists in the Church *jure divino;* that the first bishops were ordained by the Apostles as their successors, and that these orders have been transmitted by an unbroken succession to the present time; and furthermore, that without bishops there can be no valid orders, no valid sacraments, in short, no Church. It is not proposed in this paper to question the truth of this theory—to inquire whether there is adequate evidence in its favor either in the Scriptures of the New Testament, in the early Christian literature, or in the institutions of the Church of the first two centuries. Assuming that

[1] Here are a few definitions: "Apostolic succession means an unbroken series of ordination from the days of the Apostles to our time."—*Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia.* This would not be acceptable to many Churchmen, from its omission of the divine authority of the episcopal office; other Churchmen admit the succession as a fact, but deny the assumption of divine authority. "A favorite term with prelates and High Churchmen to designate what is claimed to be an unbroken line of clerical ordination from the Apostles to the present time."—McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia.* Same defect, save that in the discussion following the missing idea of divine authority is supplied. "Apostolic succession is the transmission, through the episcopate, of the power and authority committed by our Lord to his Apostles, for the guidance and govenment of the Church."—J. H. Blunt, *Theological Dictionary.* This more adequately expresses the High-Church idea than any other brief definition I have found.

the doctrine rests on the sure foundations of Scripture teaching and institutional Christianity—or, at least, allowing that this *may* be the case—our task is to trace the effects of this doctrine upon the external history and internal life of the Church of England.

Here again a definition is essential. Such an investigation should be conducted in the historical, not in the polemic, spirit, the more so as it will brush the outskirts of many a hot controversy. In what sense shall the term "Church of England" be treated? Without entering on the question whether the Church of England has had a substantive existence, apart from the Church of Rome, from the times of the Apostles until now, our inquiry will concern the history of that Church beginning with and subsequent to the movement known as the Reformation. What is historically certain is, that the Church of England received at that time by Acts of Parliament the constitution, liturgy, and doctrine that it has since substantially retained. That time is, therefore, the fitting point for our investigation to begin. The history falls naturally into two periods, the dividing line between which is the Act of Uniformity.

First Period—From the Reformation until the Passage of the Act of Uniformity, in 1662.

It does not appear that the theory of Apostolic Succession was held by any of the men whose influence shaped and controlled the Reformation of the Church of England. No trace of it is discoverable in the extant writings of the reformers, while the words and acts of the most influential among them—men like Cranmer, Grindal, and Jewell—are totally irreconcilable with such a theory. The order of bishops was recognized as a very ancient institution in the Church, and as not contrary to Scripture, but not as of undoubted apostolic origin and divine authority. Full proof of this attitude of the reformers is found in the "Resolutions of several bishops and divines," given in Burnet's Collection of Records.[1] A series of questions was

[1] *History of the Reformation*, vol. i., part ii., pp. 314–369.

submitted to these divines for answer, and replies were afterward summarized by Cranmer, then Archbishop of Canterbury. The following representative extracts leave no question as to the opinion of the leading reformers:

Question 10—*Whether bishops or priests were first? and if the priests were first, then the priest made the bishop.*

Answers.

"Canterbury: The bishops and priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion."

"London: I think the bishops were first, and yet I think it is not of importance, whether the priest then made the bishop, or else the bishop the priest; considering (after the sentence of St. Jerome) that in the beginning of the church there was none (or if it were, very small) difference between a bishop and a priest, especially touching the signification."

"Dr. Cox: Altho' by Scripture (as St. Hierome saith) priests and bishops be one, and therefore the one not before the other: yet bishops, as they be now, were after the priests, and therefore made of priests."

"Dr. Edgworth: Christ our chief-priest and bishop made his apostles priests and bishops all at once; and they did likewise make others, some priests and some bishops: and that the priests in the primitive church made bishops, I think no inconvenience; as Jerome saith, in an *Epist. ad Evagrium.* Even like as souldiers should chuse one among themselves to be their captain: so did priests chuse one of themselves to be their bishop, for consideration of his learning, gravity, and good living, etc., and also for to avoid schisms among themselves by them, that some might not draw the people one way, and others another way, if they lacked one head among them."

"(Summary by Cranmer): The bishop of St. Davids, my Lord elect of Westminster, Dr. Cox, Dr. Redmayn, say, that *at the beginning they were all one.* The bishops of York, London, Rochester, Carlisle; Drs. Day, Tresham, Symmons, Oglethorp, be in other contrary opinions. The bishop of York, and doctor Tresham, think, *that the apostles first were priests, and after were made bishops, when the overseeing of other priests was committed to them.* My lords of Duresme, London, Carlisle, Rochester, Dr. Symmons and Crafford,

think, *that the apostles first were bishops, and they after made other bishops and priests.* Dr. Coren and Oglethorpe say, *that the apostles were made bishops, and the 72 were after made priests.* Dr. Day thinks, *that bishops as they be now-a-days called, were before priests.* My lord of London, Drs. Edgworth and Robertson, think *it no inconvenience, if a priest made a bishop in that time.*"[1]

To question 13, replies equally various were given, but the purport is the same. That inquired whether, "if it fortuned a Christian prince learned, to conquer certain dominions of infidels (having none but temporal learned men with him), it be defended by God's law, that he and they should preach and teach the word of God there or no? And also make and constitute priests, or no?" The answers are summarized by Cranmer thus:

"Concerning the first part, whether laymen may preach and teach God's word? They do all argue, in such a case, *that, not only they may, but they ought to teach.* But in the second part, touching the constituting of priests of laymen, my lord of York, and doctor Edgworth, doth not agree with the other; they say that *laymen in no wise can make priests, or have such authority.* The bishops of Duresme, St. Davids, Westminster, Drs. Tresham, Cox, Leighton, Crayford, Symmons, Redmayn, Robertson, say, that laymen in such case have authority to minister the sacraments, and to make priests. My lords of London, Carlisle, and Hereford, and Dr. Coren, think, *that God in such a case would give the prince authority, call him inwardly, and illuminate him or some of his, as he did St. Paul.*"[2]

In the same collection of documents is "A Declaration Made of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests," signed by Archbishop Cranmer, the bishops of York, London, Lincoln, Sarum, and thirty-three other prelates and doctors of theology, which contains these words: "The truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention

[1] Burnet, *ubi supra*, pp. 343–346. The italics in the above extract are in the text of Burnet (Oxford ed., 1829). In every case I have scrupulously followed the typography of the authors quoted in this paper.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 357.

made of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops: nor is there any word spoken of any other ceremony used in the conferring of this sacrament, but only of prayer, and the imposition of the bishop's hands."[1]

From this evidence it clearly appears that the major part of the reformers, and those the men of greatest influence among them, did not hold the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. It is a fact, so well known one need not pause to cite evidence of it, that Cranmer and his fellow-reformers were in the closest correspondence and sympathy with the Continental reformers, and never dreamed of denying to their brethren of Geneva the character of ecclesiastical regularity.

The further one carries his investigation of the opinion of sixteenth-century divines in the Church of England, the less will become his doubt that Apostolic Succession was a dogma either quite unknown to them, or known only to be rejected. It was not held by John Jewell (1522–1571), bishop of Salisbury, since he quotes approvingly this remark of Jerome: "Let bishops understand, that they be greater than the priests, by order and custom, and not by the truth of God's ordinance."[2] It was distinctly repudiated by Richard Field (1561–1616), Dean of Gloucester, whose treatise *Of the Church* is still esteemed one of the great books of English divinity. In this treatise, first published in 1628, he says:

"It is most evident, that that wherein a bishop excelleth a presbyter, is not a distinct power of order, but an eminence and dignity only, specially yielded to one above all the rest of the same rank, for order sake, and to preserve the unity and peace of the Church. . . . And who knoweth not, that all presbyters in cases of necessity may absolve and reconcile penitents: a thing in ordinary course appropriated unto bishops? And why not, by the same reason, ordain presbyters and deacons in cases of like necessity?

[1] Burnet, *ubi supra*, p. 487.

[2] *Works*, vol. ii., p. 206, Oxford ed., 1848.

. . . Who, then, dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by presbyters in sundry Churches of the world?" [1]

It is a curious fact that the claim for a *jure divino* Church government was first set up in the Church of England, after the Reformation, by the Puritan party; and that a divine origin was claimed, not for Episcopacy as we might perhaps have expected, but for Presbyterianism. The Church divines fought their opponents, not by proclaiming a contrary *jure divino* theory of Episcopacy, but by maintaining that the Bible teaches no particular government of the Church, and that Episcopacy is lawful as not being prohibited and being clearly of very ancient origin. It is this controversial exigency that inspires this passage in the great work of the judicious Hooker:

"As for these marvellous discourses [of the Presbyterians] whereby they adventure to argue that God must needs have done the thing which they imagine was to be done; I must confess I have often wonder'd at their exceeding boldness therein. When the question is, whether God have delivered in Scripture, (as they affirm he hath) a complete particular immutable form of Church Polity: why take they that both presumptuous and superfluous labor to prove that he should have done it; there being no way in this case to prove the deed of God, saving only by producing that evidence wherein he hath done it? But if there be no such thing apparent upon record, they do as if one should demand a Legacy by force and vertue of some written Testament, wherein there being no such thing specified, he pleadeth that there it must needs be, and bringeth arguments from the love and good will which always the Testator bore, imagining that these or the like proofs will convict a Testament to have that in it, which other men can nowhere by reading find. In matters which concern the action of God, the most dutiful way on our part, is to search what God hath done, and with meekness to admire that, rather than to dispute what he in congruity of reason ought to do." [2]

[1] *Works*, vol. i., pp. 321–323, Cambridge, 1847.

[2] *Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. iii., ch. xi., Keble's ed. This passage is approvingly quoted by Stillingfleet, in his *Irenicon*.

Hooker goes even further when he admits the possibility of breaks in the succession, and furthest of all when he declares that "there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination without a bishop."[1] To be sure, he restricts these cases to two: those whom God doth himself raise up, and those in which a bishop cannot be had to ordain. But the doctrine of Apostolic Succession admits of no exceptions; a break in the succession is fatal, however it occurs.

It is not merely a question of what the divines of the Church of England believed and taught on this subject, but of what was their practice. As to this there can be no question. Keble was the highest of High Churchmen, but he was candid enough to see and record the truth; he says: "Nearly up to the time when he [Hooker] wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church in England, with no better than Presbyterian ordination."[2] In 1582 John Morrison was licensed by Archbishop Grindal to preach and administer the sacraments in the province of Canterbury, and was described in this document as having been ordained according to the "laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland," which was then virtually Presbyterian.[3] Legal recognition was, in fact, given to non-episcopal orders by the statute of the 13th of Elizabeth, which required all ministers who had been ordained by any other method than that prescribed under Edward VI. to present themselves before the bishop and give their approval of the Articles of Religion. It hardly requires evidence to show that under this law many priests obtained parishes in England who had only non-episcopal orders received abroad; but a few testimonies from eminent Churchmen will establish the fact beyond question.

Our first witness is Bishop Fleetwood, who was promoted to the see of St. Asaph in 1706. He says explicitly: "Dur-

[1] *Ibid.*, bk. vii., ch. xiv., 111.

[2] Preface to Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, p. xxxviii.

[3] *New Englander*, 1874, p. 137. It was such acts as these to which Keble refers when he says that Grindal's "connivance at the conduct of the Puritans is well known." Preface to Hooker, p. xxxii.

ing our reigns of King James and King Charles I., and up to the year 1661, we had many ministers from Scotland, from France, and the Low Countries, who were ordained by presbyters only, and not bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with cure and yet were never reordained, but only subscribed to the Articles." [1] This may be taken to be no better than second-hand authority, since Fleetwood was not a contemporary, and could not have known these facts personally, though he is little likely to be wrong about them. Let us therefore hear Bishop Joseph Hall (1574–1656), who in his "Defense of the Humble Remonstrance," says: "I know those, more than one, that by virtue only of that ordination which they have brought with them from reformed churches, have enjoyed spiritual promotions and livings, without any exception against the lawfulness of their calling." [2] Francis Bacon, though a layman, may be taken as a competent authority also, when he tells us: "Some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogative speech and censure of the churches abroad; and that so far as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers." [3]

But if these words of Bacon prove the practice of the Church, as affirmed and defended by its leading divines, to have been adverse to the theory of Apostolic Succession, they also prove that there was a party in the Church that condemned the doctrine and practice of the majority. Just when the High-Church doctrine found its first public expression, and by whom it was expressed, is a matter of some doubt. There is a tradition that Archbishop Bancroft, in a sermon preached February 9, 1589, was the first to maintain the divine right of Episcopacy, to the exclusion of every other form of Church government.[4] From the accession of

[1] Quoted in the *New Englander*, 1874, p. 132.

[2] *Works*, vol. ix., p. 356.

[3] *Advertisement Concerning Controversies of the Church of England*, 1589 (?) *Works*, Montagu's ed. vol. vii., p. 48.

[4] Hallam (*Constitutional History*, Harper's ed., p. 226) questions whether Bancroft really taught the doctrine at all.

James I. this party rapidly increased in influence and power. This prince, though bred in Presbyterianism—or, perhaps one should say, *because* so bred—was favorably disposed towards the most extreme form of prelacy possible in a Protestant Church. He was for absolutism in the State, and so took kindly to absolutism in the Church. The clergy preached passive obedience to a monarch so wise and just; and the monarch in turn threw the weight of his influence in favor of the power of the bishops and uniformity in religion.

The chief agent in this reaction was William Laud, then Bishop of London, afterwards made Archbishop of Canterbury by Charles I., who continued the policy of his father in Church and State, until his persistence lost him his throne and his head. Laud is described by Macaulay as a man of narrow understanding, slight knowledge of the world, by nature rash, irritable, superstitious—the sort of material of which bigots and persecutors are made. Hume, who should be his defender, can find nothing better to say of him than this ironical praise: "This man was virtuous, if severity of manners alone and abstinence from pleasure could deserve that name. He was learned, if polemical knowledge could entitle him to that praise. He was disinterested, but with unceasing industry he studied to exalt the priestly and prelatical character, which was his own."[1] Laud's views are to be gathered from his treatise on *Liturgy and Episcopacy* (Oxford ed., 1840), and still more from his policy. He held the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in its extreme form, and was in general what in these days is called an Anglo-Catholic. He deprecated as much the innovations of the Calvinists as the innovations of the Romanists, with this difference: the Church of Rome he recognized as a true Christian Church, having the Apostolic Succession, though in error; while to the reformed churches he refused ecclesiastical recognition, holding them to have lost the Apostolic Succession and to be no churches at all. His idea was a counter-reformation of the Church of England, that should

[1] *History of England*, vol. iv., p. 480, Harper's ed.

make it once more a branch of the great Catholic Church, by bringing it into conformity with the doctrine and usages of Ante-Nicene Christianity—the precise theory on which the Oxford movement of our own day was conducted. With this High-Church doctrine went naturally a system of sacramental grace. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration was revived and taught; the Real Presence in the sacrament was insisted on, and in token of it the communion table was removed from the middle of the area to the east end and termed an altar; the practice of auricular confession was revived, and priestly absolution was bestowed as in the Roman Church. By means of the High Commission, Laud enforced these doctrines and practices with a vigor and rigor that in a few years resulted in the complete suppression of the Moderate Churchman. Those whose consciences could not submit were imprisoned and fined, or resigned their livings and fled to the Continent or the New World. The more pliant or less courageous kept silence. The success of his policy, judged by these outward tokens, was complete in 1639, when the archbishop was able to report to the king that the bishops of several extensive dioceses were not able to find a single dissenter in their jurisdictions.[1]

It is not necessary to follow in any detail the revolution in the Church that accompanied, if it did not cause, the revolution in the State that began with the year 1640. Our purpose only requires us to notice that this Puritan revolution, and the temporary supremacy of Presbyterianism, produced a curious modification of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, which finds perhaps its best illustration in the works of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter, and after 1641 of Norwich. In 1640 he published his treatise on *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, with the approbation of Archbishop Laud. His argument he summarizes under these two heads:

"First, That episcopacy, such as you[2] have renounced,

[1] For the statements contained in this last paragraph I give no detailed citation of authorities. They may be found, in substantially the same form, in any standard English history, and are not likely to be questioned.

[2] The occasion of the treatise was the action of M. G. Grahame, Bishop of

even that which implies a fixed superiority over the rest of the clergy and jurisdiction, is not only a holy and lawful but a divine institution, and therefore cannot be abdicated without a manifest violation of God's ordinance.

"Secondly, That the Presbyterian government, so constituted as you have now submitted to it, (however vindicated under the glorious names of Christ's kingdom and ordinance, by those specious and glozing terms to bewitch the ignorant multitude, and to ensnare their consciences,) hath no true footing, either in Scripture or the practice of the Church, in all ages from Christ's time to the present."[1]

Within a twelvemonth, however, the continuance of Episcopacy was so seriously threatened that Bishop Hall was ready to "roar him an 't were any nightingale." Parliament was setting about the reformation of religion in a way that boded no good to prelacy, and Bishop Hall's *Humble Remonstrance for Liturgy and Episcopacy*, by its tone justified its title. He no longer asserts a divine right for Episcopacy, but is content to plead for its continuance on the ground of ancient usage. Replying to a charge that in de-

Orkney, who renounced his episcopal function and craved pardon for having accepted it.

[1] *Works* (Oxford, 1863), vol. ix., p. 160. Considerable light is thrown upon the character of this treatise by some private letters written by Bishop Hall to Archbishop Laud during the composition of the book. These letters were discovered among Laud's papers, neatly docketed in his own hand. In one, dated as having been received Jan. 30, 1640, Hall says: "Your grace will soon find that I have been plain enough with our Genevians; for the foreign churches I have taken the same course with our learned Bishop Andrews, as pitying their alleging necessity, not approving the form; in the meantime not thinking it best to make enemies where we may have friends." Before this, in a letter received by Laud, Jan. 22, 1639, he had said much the same thing, apparently to satisfy the archbishop that he would be severe enough on the Presbyterians: "As for my favorableness to foreign authors and churches, I foretold your grace that I held it best not to be sparing of good words, though in the reality of the tenet I have gone farther than the most others." (Hall's *Works*, vol. x., pp. 542, 543.) It is difficult to acquit the good bishop of being somewhat of a trimmer, between Laud on the one hand and the Presbyterians on the other. In his first treatise, whether by accident or design, he left open a loophole for retreat, of which he later availed himself; for though his premises logically involve the invalidity of non-episcopal orders, he refrained from drawing the conclusion in so many words, leaving it rather to the inference of his readers.

fending Episcopacy as of apostolic origin, he casts an imputation on the reformed churches which want that government, he declares this to be a "slanderous aspersion." He then defines his position in terms quite unmistakable:

"We love and honor those sister churches as the dear spouse of Christ. We bless God for them; and we do heartily wish unto them that happiness in the partnership of our administration which I doubt not but they do no less heartily wish unto themselves. . . .

"First, our position is only affirmative, implying the justifiableness and holiness of an episcopal calling, without any further implication.

"Next, when we speak of divine right, we mean not an express law of God, requiring it upon the absolute necessity of the being of a church, what hindrances soever may interpose, but a divine institution, warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had.

"Every church, therefore, which is capable of this form of government both may and ought to affect it, as that which is with so much authority derived from the apostles to the whole body of the Church upon earth; but those particular churches to whom this power and faculty is denied lose nothing of the true essence of a church, though they miss something of their glory and perfection, whereof they are barred by the necessity of their condition; neither are liable to any more imputation in their credit and esteem than an honest, frugal, officious tenant, who, notwithstanding the proffer of all obsequious services, is tied to the limitations and terms of an hard landlord."[1]

This *Remonstrance* called forth the famous "Smectymnuus" pamphlet, best known in these days for Milton's defence of it. In this the sincerity of the bishop's admissions and qualifications of the doctrine of Episcopacy was questioned, whereupon he rejoined with a *Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against Smectymnuus*, and this time his declarations were certainly explicit enough. He wrote:

"The question which you ask concerning the reason of the different entertainment given in our church to priests

[1] Hall's *Works*, vol. ix., p. 291.

converted from Rome, and to ministers who in Mary's days had received imposition of hands in reformed churches abroad, is merely personal, neither can challenge my decision. Only I give you these two answers. That what fault soever may be in the easy admittance of those who have received Romish orders, the sticking at the admission of our brethren returning from reformed churches, was not in case of ordination, but of institution: they had been acknowledged ministers of Christ, without any other hands laid upon them; but, according to the laws of our land, they were not perhaps capable of institution to a benefice, unless they were so qualified as the statutes of this realm so require. . . .

"For your question, you still talk of sole ordination and sole jurisdiction; you may, if you please, keep that pair of soles for your next shoes; we contend not for such an height of propriety proprietorship, neither do we practise it; they are so ours that they should not be without us, as we have formerly showed. That, therefore, there should be a power of lawful ordination and government in every settled church, it is no less than necessary; but that, in what case soever of extremity and irresistible necessity, this should be only done by episcopal hands, we never meant to affirm; it is enough that regularly it should be their act." [1]

Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, is the last divine of this period whose writings it is necessary to examine at length. He is a representative of the broader Churchmen of his day who sought to reunite the Church of England on a basis of mutual concession—both sides giving up their *jure divino* theories of church government, and accepting the episcopate as an historic fact and a lawful and convenient polity. His *Irenicon*, published in 1661, was devoted to this end. Against the extremists on both sides, he argued thus:

"Whatever binds the Church of God as an institution of Christ, must bind as an universal standing law; but one form of Government in the Church cannot bind it as a standing Law. For whatever binds as a standing law, must either be expressed in direct terms as such a Law; or deduced by a necessary consequence from his Laws, as of an universally binding nature; but any one particular form of Government

[1] Hall's *Works*, vol. ix., pp. 356, 357.

in the Church, is neither expressed in any direct terms by Christ, not can be deduced by just consequence; therefore no such form of Government is instituted by Christ. If there be any such Law, it must be produced, whereby it is determined in Scripture, either that there must be superiority or equality among Church Officers as such after the Apostle's decease." [1]

From the cases of Timothy and Titus, Stillingfleet infers "that it is not repugnant to the constitution of the Churches in Apostolic times, for men to have power over more than one particular congregation." He denies that the superiority of some officers over others is a necessary law—in other words, the episcopate is neither contrary to Scripture nor *jure divino.*[2]

The High-Church party, however, was in no mood to listen to the exhortations of Bishop Stillingfleet. Flushed by its triumph at the Restoration, it would hearken to no counsels of moderation, but was resolved to use its power to the utmost. The Presbyterians had used their power with more zeal than discretion when they were in the ascendant, and now they were again to feel the full rigors of Church law. The Act of Uniformity for the first time gave legal sanction

[1] *Irenicon*, part ii., chap. iv.

[2] *Ibid.* See Stillingfleet's *Complete Works*, 6 vols., folio, London, 1709. The Bishop fortifies himself in his position by a large number of quotations from Church of England divines, many of which I have already given above. Some that I have not been able to verify, yet find exceptionally significant, I append:

Archbishop Whitgift "On Church Government": "The form of discipline is not particularly and by name set down in Scripture. No kind of Government is expressed in the Word, or can necessarily be concluded from thence."

Dr. Loe, in "Complaint of the Church": "No certain form of Government is prescribed in the Word, only general rules laid down for it."

Bishop Bridges, on "Church Government": "God hath not expressed the form of Church Government, at least not so as to bind us to it."

King James: "That the Civil power in any Nation, hath the right of prescribing what internal form of Church Government it please, which doth most agree to the Civil form of Government in the State."

"That incomparable man, Mr. Holes," as Stillingfleet calls him, in his "Tract of Schism": "For they do but abase themselves and others, that would persuade us, that Bishops by Christ's institutions have any superiority over men, farther than of Reverence."

See *Irenicon*, part ii., chap. vii.

to the Church theory of episcopal orders by forbidding any person to hold any benefice or administer the sacraments "before he be ordained a priest by Episcopal ordination." That law still stands, unmodified in that particular, as the rule of the Church of England.

Second Period—From the Act of Uniformity to the Present Time.

For more than fifty years after the passage of the Act of Uniformity the High-Church Party was triumphant in the Church of England. The reigns of Charles II. and James II. afforded it every encouragement, and even the Revolution of 1688 made but little change in its character; for the great Whig families through whom that change was brought about were aristocrats and Churchmen. The great body of the clergy, indeed, not only retained their exclusive Church theories, but were the mainstay of the Jacobite party, that long threatened to undo the work of the Revolution. The divines of this period, therefore, almost invariably teach high doctrine regarding the Church. The learned and pious Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down, maintains at great length that Christ did institute a government in his Church, first committed to the Apostles, with a power of joining others, and appointing successors. Christ himself, he declared, hath made the office of bishop distinct from Presbyters, giving to Apostles a power to do some offices perpetually necessary, which to others he gave not.[1]

So Isaac Barrow (1630–1677), the much esteemed master of Trinity College, Cambridge, declares the rejection of Episcopacy to be almost a schism involving the guilt of mortal sin.[2] Rather more moderate in the terms of their adhesion, but still unmistakably subscribing to the doctrine

[1] "Of the Sacred Order and Officer of Episcopacy, by Divine Institution, Apostolical Tradition, and Catholic Practice." *Works*, vol. vii. Heber's ed., London, 1822.

[2] Rejectio regiminis Episcopalis, ubi habentur orthodoxi et legitimi episcopi, facit proprie schisma mortale. "De Regimine Episcopali." *Works*, vol. viii., p. 33, Oxford ed., 1830.

of Apostolic Succession, are William Beveridge[1] (1638–1708), Bishop of St. Asaph, and John Bramhall (1593–1663), Archbishop of Armagh, whose writings on this subject were first published in Dublin in 1674–7.[2]

One of the few names that can be quoted at this time on the liberal side is that of Gilbert Burnet (1643–1715), Bishop of Salisbury. In his exposition of the articles he maintains that non-Episcopal ordination may be valid in exceptional cases, but as this work was condemned by the Lower House of Convocation, a citation from it could have little authority. Bishop Pearson (1612–1686), from one or two of his *obiter dicta*, would seem to have held very moderate, if not low, church views.

This general prevalence of High Church views explains, more completely than any other thing, the separation of the Wesleyan Reformation from the Church of England. It is well known that the Wesleys had no schismatic intent, and John Wesley in particular not only lived but died in the communion of the English Church, and was buried in the robes of a presbyter. He did not hold, however, to the invalidity of non-episcopal orders, but it is highly probable —in my judgment morally certain—that he would never have laid hands on Thomas Coke, presbyter like himself of the Church of England, to make him bishop or "superintendent" of the Methodist churches in America, if any bishop or bishops of the Church of England would have performed a like service. Wesley and his followers had, however, so completely broken with the High-Church party, his great revival was so uniformly and bitterly opposed by that party, that episcopal ordination was under the circumstances impossible of procurement. Even one who sin-

[1] He maintains in his *De Episcopis* that there have been three orders of the ministry from the Apostles down, and that "nihil inter jus divinum et Apostolicum interest." *Works*, vol. xii., pp. 153–187, Oxford, 1848.

[2] "As for our parts, we believe Episcopacy to be at least an Apostolic institution, approved by Christ Himself in the Revelation, ordained in the infancy of Christianity as a remedy against schism; and we bless God that we have a clear succession of it." "A just vindication of the Church of England from the unjust aspersion of criminal schism."—*Works*, vol. i., p. 271, Oxford, 1842.

cerely and firmly holds the doctrine of Apostolic Succession might well urge that its vehement advocacy in this instance deprived the Church of England in large measure of the great spiritual impulse of the Wesleyan revival, and perpetuated the schism that of all in modern times has had consequences the most serious and far reaching.

The indirect result of the Wesleyan movement was seen in the growth of an evangelical element among the bishops and clergy of the English Church. Of these George Tomline (1750–1827), Bishop of Winchester, is an example. This highly esteemed theologian says;

"It is not contended that the bishops, priests, and deacons of England are at present precisely the same that bishops, presbyters, and deacons were in Asia Minor seventeen hundred years ago. We only maintain that there have always been bishops, priests, and deacons in the Christian Church since the days of the apostles, with different powers and functions, it is allowed, in different countries and at different periods; but the general principles and duties which have respectively characterized these clerical orders have been essentially the same at all times and in all places, and the variations which they have undergone have only been such as have ever belonged to all persons in public situations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and which are, indeed, indispensable from everything in which mankind are concerned in this transitory and fleeting world.

"I have thought it right to take this general view of the ministerial office, and to make these observations upon the clerical orders subsisting in this kingdom, for the purpose of pointing out the foundations and principles of Church authority, and of showing that our ecclesiastical establishment is as nearly comformable as change of circumstances will permit to the practice of the primitive Church. But, though I flatter myself that I have proved Episcopacy to be an apostolic institution, yet I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every church should be governed by bishops. No church can exist without some government; but, though there must be rules and orders for the proper discharge of the offices of public worship, though there must be fixed regulations concerning the appointment of ministers, and though subordination among them is expedient in the highest de-

gree, yet it does not follow that all these things must be precisely the same in every Christian country; they may vary with the other varying circumstances of human society, with the extent of a country, the manners of its inhabitants, the nature of its civil government, and many other peculiarities which might be specified. As it has not pleased our Almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. But he has, in the most explicit terms, enjoined obedience to all governors, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and whatever may be their denomination, as essential to the character of a true Christian. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents." [1]

The authority of William Paley (1743–1805), which in his day was very great, may be quoted in favor of this view.[2] Archbishop Whately, the founder and leader of the modern Broad-Church party, advocated an even more liberal view of the Church, with all the resources of his learning and wit.[3]

[1] "*Elements of Christian Theology*, London; 1843, vol. ii., pp. 346–7. The dedication of the first edition of this work is dated July 1, 1799.

[2] "The apostolic directions which are preserved in the writings of the New Testament seem to exclude no ecclesiastical constitution which the experience and more instructed judgment of future ages might find it expedient to adopt." . . . "If there be any truth in these observations, they lead to this temperate and charitable conclusion: 'that Christianity may be professed under any form of church government.'" . . . "The chief article of regulation upon which the judgment of some Protestant churches dissents from ours is, that whilst they have established a perfect parity among their clergy, we prefer a distinction of orders in the church, not only as recommended by the usage of the purest times, but as well calculated to promote, what all churches must desire, the credit and efficacy of the sacerdotal office."—Sermon on Eph. iv., 11, 12. *Works*, edited by Edmund Paley. London, 1830. Vol. vi., pp. 91–94.

[3] "Amidst the wars and tumults and general confusion which took place at various times during that space [eighteen centuries], and especially during what are called 'the dark ages,' when ignorance and barbarism, as well as lawless violence, were so prevalent, it may have happened, more than once, that some person who had never been regularly ordained, or, perhaps, even baptized, may have continued to intrude himself into the ministerial office; and to have even attained the rank of a bishop; and may thus have been the

More recent writers of the same school, like Dean Stanley[1] and Dean Alford, Professors Jacob[2] and Hatch,[3] have strongly maintained this theory. Though a party numerically small, the writers of this school have always wielded an influence second to none in the Church; and among their number have been included many of the ripest theological scholars of the present century. Nor has this view lacked representation among the bishops of recent days. The opinion of Dr. Lightfoot, the late Bishop of Durham, who had no superior as a biblical and historical scholar, is well known. In his judgment presbyters and bishops were one during the New-Testament period; and the order of bishops was gradually developed from the presbytery—a theory wholly

ordainer of others, the successors of whom may possibly be among ourselves at this day. There is no Christian minister now existing that can trace up, with complete certainty, his own ordination, through perfectly regular steps, to the times of the Apostles. And, accordingly, if the reality of the ministerial office were made to depend, not on a man's being an acknowledged minister of a Christian Church, but on a certain mysterious sacramental virtue, transmitted from hand to hand, in unbroken succession from the Apostles, there would be a most distressing and incurable uncertainty in each Christian's mind, whether he were really baptized, really ordained, or really partaker of any Christian privileges."—Whately's *General View of the Rise, Progress, and Corruptions of Christianity*, New York, 1860, pp. 169, 170. Compare Macaulay's incidental discussion of the question in his essay, "Gladstone on Church and State."

[1] "It is certain that throughout the first century, and for the first part of the second, that is, through the later chapters of the Acts, the Apostolical Epistles, and the writings of Clement and Hermas, Bishop and Presbyter were convertible terms." *Christian Institutions*, American ed., p. 187. "It is as sure that nothing like modern Episcopacy existed before the close of the first century as it is that nothing like modern Presbyterianism existed after the beginning of the second." (*Ibid.*, p. 188.) "It was only by slow degrees that the name of Bishop became appropriated to one chief pastor raised high in rank and station above the rank of the clergy." (*Ibid.*, p. 194.) At Alexandria presbyters long retained the right of ordaining bishops; see Stanley's *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, lecture vii.

[2] *The Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*, by the Rev. G. A. Jacob, D.D., chap. iii., on the Christian ministry, and Appendix D.

[3] *Organization of the Early Christian Church*, London, 1881. Hatch holds that ordination was at first only appointment, that imposition of hands was not a universal rite, and that ordination was not supposed in the early Church to confer exclusive spiritual powers. Pp. 126–132.

irreconcilable with Apostolic Succession. The present learned Bishop of Worcester (Browne) is also on record as a disbeliever in the doctrine, having publicly declared himself in favor of receiving into the Church, without reordination, ministers who lack Episcopal orders, if that promote would the progress of Church unity.

The Evangelical and Broad-Church parties have not been suffered, however, to teach their views without vigorous protest. The most powerful protest was that which began to be made in Oxford about the year 1833. The "Declaration of Principles and Objects," which Keble, Newman, and others put forth at this time, declared that the ends these leaders had at heart were "to rouse the clergy, to inculcate the Apostolic Succession,[1] and to defend the Liturgy." The avowed object was to restore the Church of England to the model of the Church of the first four centuries. The leaders spoke bitterly of the reformers and the Reformation; they adopted essentially the programme of Laud; the celibacy of the clergy, the Real Presence in the eucharist, baptismal regeneration, and auricular confession were cardinal doctrines with them. They delighted in the title of Anglo-Catholics. The attempt failed in part, collapsing as an organized movement with the departure of Newman, Ward, and others to the Church of Rome; but its influence has never ceased in the Church of England. Men like Pusey and Mozley, Canon Liddon and Dean Church, remained to leaven the lump with High-Church principles; and they have powerfully affected the life of the Church.

A word in closing this discussion. It may seem curious that in investigating this matter, one should pass by—whether accidentally or by design—the articles and liturgy of the Church of England, as evidence in the case. This evidence has not been cited for two reasons: First, there has been in the Church endless dispute as to the meaning of

[1] *The Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman*, edited by Anne Mozley, show what an essential connection this whole movement had with the idea of the succession. See, for example, vol. i., pp. 379, 383, 396; vol. ii., pp. 17, 146, 358.

the various declarations in the Prayer-book regarding the Church and its ministry. These are not easily reconcilable, and both those who accept and those who reject Apostolic Succession appeal to the Prayer-book, and draw from it plausible arguments. Whether by accident or design—and most Church historians hold it was by design—the Prayer-book was so made that men of very diverse views could accept it as an expression of their views, and find somewhere in it something that would sustain them. Secondly, an authoritative interpretation of the meaning of the Prayer-book has lately been put forth by the bishops of the Church of England and of her sister Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. In the terms of Christian union that have been widely published and very generally discussed, other bodies of Christians are required to accept only the "historic episcopate." No doubt that term is one of considerable elasticity of meaning; but precisely because it is thus elastic it does not shut anybody up to the necessity of believing in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. On the very highest authority, therefore, the doctrine of Apostolic Succession is declared to be one in which belief is voluntary, and any man can be a perfectly orthodox Churchman, in either England or the United States,[1] if he is willing to recognize the Episcopacy as of very ancient, though of human, origin; and submits to the rule of a bishop, as neither commanded nor contrary to Scripture, but an expedient and useful form of Church government. The Church of England, in making this declaration, returns to

[1] After the manuscript of this article had gone to the printer, there appeared in the *Independent* (March 8th and 15th) a series of letters from the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, whose contents necessitate some modification of this sentence. These letters are not, perhaps, to be regarded as an official commentary on the Lambeth-Chicago articles, but they clearly indicate an almost unanimous consensus of opinion among the American bishops that the validity of non-episcopal ordination can under no circumstances be recognized by their Church, even should it appear that such recognition is an indispensable condition of Christian unity. The only ground on which this refusal can consistently be based is, of course, a belief in the Apostolic Succession of orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the lack of such succession in the ministry of other denominations.

the ground of the reformers, who gave to the Church her present constitution; and repudiates the system and character that Laud and Newman would have thrust upon her. In other words, she remains Protestant and refuses to become Roman.

VIII

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

By Rev. GILBERT FEARING WILLIAMS, Washington, D.C.

On tombs of ancient Egypt have been found inscribed requests, as from those buried beneath them, that passers-by would pray for them. Here and here alone in all the ancient world we first find such praying held to be of any avail to the departed. Later and later it becomes a characteristic doctrine by consequence, of the views of ancient Paganism almost everywhere concerning the dead. In pagan Greece the very chief of the philosophers, and in pagan Rome the poets so view the condition of the departed as to make inevitable the thought of praying to effect some improvement in their condition. In the modern Paganism of India we have the burdensome services of the Srádd'ha or funeral obsequies for the repose of the dead, and for the securing of the efficacy of which it is inculcated that "donations of cattle, land, gold, silver, and other things" should be made by the man himself at the approach of death, or, "if he be too weak, by another in his name."

In Tartary "the Gurjumi, or prayers for the dead," says a most eminent authority, "are very expensive."

Works on Greece tell us of the *expensive* character of the mysterious sacrifice called the Teleté and to which Plato refers; and works on Egypt show us the exacting and expensive character for the celebration of funeral rites, and especially for the offices for the dead.

From ancient Egypt then the practice most evidently came, as the best works of the ripe scholarship and research of our day on that deeply interesting country very clearly show. We may say, and thus represent the exact truth of

our subject, that in Pagan Egypt we find the incubating nest of the practice of praying for the dead.

From this source we may trace it forward into the religion of the Jews, not as the latter was established by Almighty God through Moses, for there it is not to be found, but into the Jewish religion (yet not accepted by all Jews even then) as it was corrupted by the "Traditionists," called also Rabbinists or Talmudists, constituting one of the three classes of Jews existing when *Messiah* appeared amongst them.

The Jews contracted this notion of prayers for the dead in their associations with the Babylonians during their captivity among them. On their return from this captivity, weakened in faith, they bring back with them the germs of this notion. Hence in the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament there is no intimation whatever of such a thing as prayers for the dead. Most certainly then will we look in vain in Old or New Testament to find preceptively or by example any such practice enjoined. In the Apocryphal 2d Book of the Maccabees we do find a reference to prayers for the departed. But in the first place the Maccabean books represent the Jewish religion when the corruptions of "Traditionists" had been introduced. Again, the books of Maccabees contain strong passages contradicting the idea that the departed either received or were to be benefited by prayer. Moreover the particular passages in 2d Maccabees are not altogether free from the well formed suspicion that they are interpolations of a later period. Yet again, the apocryphal Book of Wisdom sets forth in a canonical Scripture spirit, and even in phraseology that, "the souls of the righteous ARE in the hand of God, and there shall no torment touch them. In the sight of the *unwise* they seemed to die, and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction, BUT THEY ARE IN PEACE. For though they be punished in the sight of men, yet is their hope full of immortality . . . for God proved them and found them worthy of Himself . . . for grace and mercy are to His saints, and He hath care for His elect." And again, the

Prayers for the Dead, as referred to in 2d Maccabees, having been repudiated, in that the objects of those prayers are nowhere now recognized as within the character of life and conduct entitling them to the benefit of prayers, this solitary instance in this single and apocryphal book becomes removed from the sphere of evidence, and becomes a testimony which by universal agreement, it seems, is to be repudiated—indeed has been.

God gives through Moses minute directions concerning the dying and the burial of the dead. Every service and ceremonial for every feature of Jewish religious, and domestic life is found there, yet not a word nor an intimation of any prayers *for* the departed. Surely if it had been any part of the religion of the Jews, so comforting a privilege had never been permitted by God to be a matter even of legitimate inference, but been made a matter of positive teaching. That there is, as I say, a dead silence on this subject, preceptively or by example, in the whole Old Testament Scriptures, is such a fact as compels all lovers of truth to be cautious how they treat it.

Being absent entirely from Jewish orthodoxy, it can carry no weight whatever in its favor that we find it only as part of Jewish heterodoxy—as the work of the "Traditionists."

It is claimed by the argument *a silentio*, that the Divine Saviour because He did not, *ipsisimis verbis*, condemn it, He therefore approved it. But our blessed Lord did denounce the Jewish corruptive introduction of these prayers as permissible either to individuals of their faith or to be used in their synagogue services. He did so when He denounced the *Traditions* by which His Father's religion had been adulterated, and under which this idea of praying for the dead was included, because it was essentially sanctioned in the Jewish creed as a work purely, as we know, of the "Traditionists." And so when Justin Martyr was defending the Christian religion in his discussion with the Jew Trypho he tells him: "The Word of God *despises* the *Tradition* of the Jews"—(*Dial. cum Trypho*, cap. lxxx). The Maccabean prayers for the dead were among those "despised traditions of the Jews."

To make the Holy Jesus the advocate of the prayers for the dead introduced by the Jewish corruptionists, who placed the Mishna on a level with the written law of Moses, and, in effect, far above it, is to make Him endorse as a part of his Father's old religion that which the Father nowhere teaches in the great canonical Scriptures.

There is no point upon which in the ancient Church the great fathers were so in agreement as upon the point of the supremacy of the Scriptures as the rule of faith. On all subjects they speak as men expressing private opinions, and there is much disagreement among them, but in the Scriptures as the Rule of Faith I find them more in harmony than on any other question. In vain then will we search in either Testament for an example or a command authorizing us to regard as necessary or even proper, the asking anything for those beloved souls "who have departed this life in God's true faith and fear." We will find in the sacred pages many exhortations to prayer; and important subjects are pointed out in great variety for the employment of devotional hours. Supplications for all sorts and conditions of men are enjoined. The old and the young; those that rejoice, and those that mourn; those that rule, and those that obey; unbelievers and Christians; the evil and the good; all these and many other divisions of human society are in their turn recommended to our pious attention; but it is always with a reference to the condition of those who still dwell on the earth, not of those whose bodies already sleep in the dust. We are taught to supplicate for the wicked, that they may be converted, and for the righteous, that they may abound yet more and more in all faith, and love, and godliness *whilst they are in this present world*; but neither for the wicked, that they may be pardoned, nor for the righteous, that they may grow more and more in happiness when they have been taken away. A *gradual advancement* of the *living* towards perfection in grace is a frequent theme in the apostolic requests unto the Lord; but in the entire Word of God from cover to cover we will not find a single passage in which the inspired

writers ever distinctly ask for gradual advancement of the departed towards a perfection in glory. "Peace and love from God the Father" is the opening or closing desire of several epistles to the *existing* or *living* members of the different churches; but "peace," and "rest," and "refreshment," and "light" is never once wished to be given to the departed Christians--on the contrary, *they* are expressly and in very words declared to possess rest, and to be at rest and in peace. How is it possible that the consolations of prayers for *peace*, light, refreshment, and rest for the faithful departed are so wholly wanting in those precious pages of "the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort," and in the teaching of "the Man of Sorrows," who was *so* "acquainted with grief"? Did the Father forget to speak of them in His Word? Did the holy and blessed Jesus, His Son, forget to teach us so coveted a principle? Were the apostles so heartless, if they heard this from the Holy Spirit, who was to teach them afresh, by way of remembrance, "all things whatsoever that the Lord Jesus had told them," that they both suppressed the teaching, and refused to give the benefit even of their own prayers for those converted by them, and departing this life under their very eye? Could the great Paul solemnly assure the Christian world that "he had not shunned to declare unto them *the whole Gospel of Christ*," and yet have paid such indifferent attention to the Divine Teacher, while learning the Gospel, that he never listened to catch, that he might impart, instruction in the duty and propriety of living survivors praying for departed loved ones? How shall we understand the absence of the most positive teaching from the Divine Scriptures on a subject that touches our hearts so deeply, and with which our hearts are more constantly concerned than almost any other, and that is, our beloved dead, and if we may do anything to relieve or advance them in the intermediate state?

In the Divine Scriptures are no prayers for the departed and no warrant that we may presume so to pray.

In post-apostolic days, beginning with St. Clement of Rome as one must, there is not a hint in his writings of any

such thing as *praying for the dead*, but very decided evidence against it. The same is true of the writings of Ignatius. In Polycarp, Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Hegisippus, Theophilus of Antioch, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Minutius Felix, Hippolytus, and Clement of Alexandria not a single word of such prayers, but most positive teaching against it.

In his *Apologies*, especially his first, Justin Martyr, when he pleaded for toleration for the Christian religion before the emperors, used the opportunity thus afforded him for speaking out fully and plainly. Hence the free, frank, and communicative character of his *Apologies*. Knowing the emperors had heard the Christian assemblies' rites and teachings misrepresented, he tells them in detail of the proceedings in their worshipping gatherings; what books were read; what the character of the sermons preached; what the nature of their prayers, even entering into some of the very petitions used; in what attitude of body they were offered; in what places of the service the ministers were accompanied by the people, and in what parts he officiated alone; what were their sacraments; what was the mode of administering the sacrament of Baptism; what promises they made at it, and what benefits they believed themselves to receive by it; what was the Eucharist; what its ceremonial; for whom it was lawful to partake of it, and what were the blessings to be derived from it (*Apol.*, 1st, chap. 61, 65, 66; also Blunt on *Early Fathers*, pp. 132, 133.)

In these *Apologies* we shall not discover the slightest appearance of any desire or purpose, on Justin's part, to conceal or deceive, but on the other hand we do see everywhere indicated the most earnest wish to conciliate and deserve confidence by the most frank exposition of the perfect innocence and simplicity of the Christian ritual, and by opening to these emperors a full knowledge of the sacraments. Justin Martyr, like others of the fathers of the early Church, well knew the danger to himself personally and to his own Christian character, as well as to the precious faith of the divine Lord, if he had kept back any fact in an appeal or apology, which he declared to be a full and truthful one. Consequently so

careful was he against any concealment that he expressly tells the emperors that the cruelty visited upon the Christians was the result of ignorance of their religion on the part of their enemies, and expresses it as his principal desire to remove that ignorance that there might not be this plea, at least, for their further persecution. With these facts before us we can better understand the full and explicit description of the mode of celebrating the Holy Eucharist in the Christian Catholic Church in his day, as detailed by Justin Martyr in his *First Apology* (chapters 65–67). If any service for the *dead* had been taught or accepted as part of the Church's deposit of faith, we naturally would expect to find the fact, both of the practice recognized and for what in behalf of the dead supplications were made, detailed by Justin here. But no mention was made of the dead, or even allusion to them in this or any other service of the Church explained by him. Here, then, is historic witness that up through Justin's time the Catholic Church of Christ in conformity, as it evidently supposed itself to be, to the Divine Scriptures, never used any prayers *for* or *to* the dead. Will it be said Justin, on the score of the "Secret Discipline," quietly suppressed a knowledge of this practice in question from the Pagan emperors? What was to be gained by a suppression of this practice, and yet, being so explicit concerning the more sacred ordinance—the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist? But if suppression of anything done or taught in the early Catholic Church were a practice among the early Christians, how shall we be able to reconcile such conduct with Pliny the Younger's testimony, after a careful examination into the conduct and principles of the Christians, "everywhere [then] spoken against"; a part of which *testimony*, *ipissimis verbis*, was this, that "*they bind themselves* by a solemn oath *not to be guilty* of ANY *fraud*, NEVER TO FALSIFY THEIR WORD, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it." (*Plinii Epp.*, Lib. x., Ep. 97.)

These *Apologies* of Justin are exceedingly valuable in the

study of the formation of the early liturgies, in which, also, *originally* there was no mention whatever of the dead.

The most positive evidence that the early Christians never prayed for the departed is to be found in a large collection of facts and passages from all the fathers before the time of Justin. So far chronologically by the rule of St. Vincent of Lerins (which is, that "within the Catholic Church itself we must take great care that we hold that which has been *believed everywhere, always, and by all men*; for that is truly and properly Catholic"), praying for the dead finds no support.

Not a particle of evidence, to sustain the practice from Justin's time back to the days of the Apostles. In fact, to extend the scope of time covered by this assertion there is no evidence in behalf of prayers for or to the dead before the time of Tertullian, A.D. 200.

The very first mention of such prayers comes from Tertullian himself, a host of learned authors of all the churches admitting this. But whether they admit it or not, such is the fact beyond all possible denial.

And it is only after Tertullian became a Montanist heretic that he breaks the silence of the whole ancient Catholic Church, up to his day observed, with this mention of prayers for the dead. When a Christian Catholic, he makes not the slightest reference whatever to such a practice as even then thought of in the Church, but has as such left the very strongest teaching negativing such belief.

When, as a Montanist heretic, he does refer to it, he does not by a single syllable indicate that such a thing as praying for the dead was at all practised in the Catholic Church around him in the world, nor does he furnish a particle of evidence, in all his extant works, which would preclude the supposition that such a practice was one of the peculiar notions, or outgrowths of, or appropriations from, the old Pagan notions, by his own heretical Montanistic sect. (See Tertull. *De Anima*, c. lviii., and Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*.) He really appears to attribute his views to the teaching of Montanus, the head of his sect. All the evidence we

have from Tertullian on prayers for the dead is his simply,—and without citing or adducing a single warrant from recognized sources of evidence,—making a point against second marriages (which he considered and pronounced to be adulterous), by attempting to show that the woman or man once married, "prays," as he says, "for the soul of his [or her] deceased partner, that he or she may have fellowship together *in the first resurrection*." And from this point of his teaching he proceeds to ridicule (a weapon of which he was not always a scrupulous master) the idea that the husband married a second time can come with acceptance before the Lord to "*commemorate*," as he says, "*two* wives" in prayer,—the whole of his testimony on this point looking as if the views of prayers for the dead he held originated largely in his own mind, and were fabricated to sustain a hobby—and a flat contradiction as it is of the teaching of our Divine Lord and his Apostles—that a second marriage was adulterous.

Where did Tertullian get his authority for breaking the death-like silence of the ages before him in the primitive Catholic Church, with his ideas of such prayers? He himself answers this question. After naming several customs of discipline and ceremonial usages, *including prayers for the dead* (but not, however, any matters of *faith*),—which customs for the most part are now repudiated by all the branches of the Church, Tertullian adds: "If for these and other regulations you demand the law of the Scriptures *none can be found; tradition* will be held up before you as originating, *usage* as confirming, and faith as practising them (Tertull., *De Corona*, c. iii., and iv.). He nowhere asserts or claims *praying for* the dead to be an *apostolic* tradition. And to show what little respect his "tradition," "usage," and "faith" are entitled to or receive there is no Church, Anglican, Greek, or Roman, and no Christian of any type or school that accepts Tertullian's views on praying for the dead, or his forms or phraseology of such prayers, or that does not in a positive way scout his sentiments entirely. Then what is his opin-

ion worth? He can be cited only for such a practice as he taught or indulged, because his "tradition," "usage," and "faith" are urged as that behind which he would sustain himself; if, therefore, he be rejected as a witness and his views of prayers for the dead be universally repudiated, as they are, it follows that, in repudiating the practice as he presents it, he himself is rejected, and in rejecting him we reject the prop, or first foundation writer, on whom the practice rests for its start in the ancient days of the Church Catholic. Tertullian's works, Bishop Kaye on *Tertullian*, Ackerman's *Christian Elements in Plato*, and the superb Bampton Lectures for 1886, by the Rev. Dr. Charles Biggs, on "The Christian Platonists of Alexandria," are works of necessary study on our subject.

Tertullian when speaking of his prayers for the dead, *i. e.*, as he refers to the practice, says they were made at the customary *annual* oblation of the commemorative "*thanksgiving*" for souls "already received into the *presence* of the Lord." What therefore I have briefly given concerning Tertullian shows that, his never having given an intimation of such prayers when a Catholic father, but referring to them only when a Montanist heretic and excommunicate from the Church, then speaking of such a view of the practice as no Church and no individual Christian anywhere accepts and follows; and his confessing, evidently when challenged by Church people to give Scripture proof and warrant for his teaching about prayers for the dead, that no such Scripture proof could be found, makes his testimony utterly valueless, because absolutely false.

His testimony concerning the *commemorating* the *pious* dead," by "an annual" oblation of "*thanksgiving*,"—to use his very words, is not inconsistent with the essence and spirit of the *Scriptural* religion of the Christian Catholic Church. But that he ever taught that prayer was offered as a generally prevailing practice, or as being *helpful* to the dead, there is nothing in his writings to warrant.

Nay, in several places, he rather strongly negatives, inferentially, such teaching. And the scope of the prayers

for the dead he refers to and uses is that the departed righteous "may have part in the *first* resurrection, not at all for any change in their condition, either as being released from sin, or advanced in any way, between death and the first resurrection, but only, as I say, that they may come back to enjoy the millennium, and not be detained till the second resurrection after the millennium when the final judgment and doom are fixed for the wicked. But even in this view Tertullian's teachings flatly contradict the most express teachings of our Lord and the Holy Apostles, which constitute the sweetest consolation of the Christian religion, viz., the divine right guaranteed to every faithful soul, of coming back with Christ as "His first-fruits," with no mention or hint of any prayer as being at all needed to secure it for the departed righteous, or hindering their coming if such prayers be not offered.

Tertullian's prayers are all given an application or limitation which could never have been a Catholic practice because they exclude souls whose offence in Tertullian's eye—I refer to monogamy—is, by express statement on the Divine page, no offence whatever in the eye of the Divine Master and Judge. For these reasons weighed with the additional facts that no Christian writer before him mentions or even faintly alludes to such a thing as prayers for the dead, but *per contra* some of them do furnish evidence which makes it impossible to our believing for a moment there was anywhere observed such a practice in their day—I say for these reasons this testimony of Tertullian is simply and justly entitled to no credit, and his whole position therefore impossible of defence.

It is important to remember that this very writer, who is the first to introduce the mention of prayers for the dead, has left behind him on record this testimony against any prayers benefiting the departed soul: "We therefore maintain that *every* soul, whatever be its age on quitting the body, *remains unchanged* in the same *until* the time shall come when the *promised perfection* shall be realized in a state only tempered to the measure of the peerless angels."

Here positively declaring his belief that in the state intermediate to death and the full fruition of bliss in heaven after the great resurrection, the soul does and can experience no change;—so, thereby, he sets forth that his idea of prayers for the dead was simply that of commemorative *thanksgiving*, as he indeed so styles these prayers, and not in any sense, as recognizing any compensatory discipline which prayers can improve to the souls, or souls continue to suffer under, if no prayers be offered.

Scholars charge Tertullian with self-contradictions—this may be a sample; or to his "very obscure style," which is a criticism that the eminent father, Lactantius passes upon him, may be attributed this seeming contradiction. But of one thing we can have no doubt, that it is only after having heretically forsaken the Christian Catholic Church and under his heretical following he issues the tractates in which, exclusively, we find his references to prayers for the dead. It is evident therefore that he is not the authority upon whom Christians can justify themselves in adopting such a clearly-to-be-traced pagan-born practice as praying for the dead, a practice which the Jews brought back from Babylon as a gross corruption of their religion; which our Divine Lord severely denounced in them as among the corrupting "traditions of men"; which some modern Jewish scholars admit and repudiate as a corruption of their religion as given them by God, and which distinguished authorities like Dr. McCaul and others have most learnedly shown to form no part whatever of the inspired faith of Mosaic Judaism.

When we add that Tertullian held and taught that, in places where there were no clergy, any Christian *layman* could exercise the functions of the *priesthood*, by baptizing and consecrating and administering the Holy Eucharist, we can see that those who cite him as the foundation stone in the early centuries of the Church for prayers for the dead, could be and should be held to both cite and follow him, for *laymen* as such, under certain conditions, being warranted in exercising all the more sacred functions of the priesthood. I think we will be quite justified in heeding this sound

Catholic advice of St. Jerome: "Read Origen, *Tertullian*, Novatus, Arnobius, Apollinaris, and others of the ecclesiastical writers, but with this *caution*, that we should make choice of that which is good, but take heed of embracing that which is not so; according to the Apostle who bids us prove all things, but hold fast only that which is good." (*Hier. Ep.*, 76, *ad Tranquil.*)

By St. Jerome's advice Tertullian cannot stand as a witness in favor of the practice under review.

But Tertullian speaks of the harmless "annual commemorative thanksgivings" for the holy examples of the righteous dead, and is followed by St. Cyprian, who explicitly connects Tertullian's name with the practice. Strange that Cyprian should still consider him as his "master," as he styled him, even after he became an excommunicated heretic. Yet so it seems he does. But he only follows him in the idea of "commemorative thanksgivings" for the holy dead. As neither of these authors by word or hint asserts that prayer for the dead was of universal adoption in the primitive Church, the conclusion becomes reasonable that, as these two men represented one branch of the Church, the African, therefore these "commemorations" may be said to be, at best, but a provincial practice belonging to the African Church alone, because found only there. And these facts throw a great deal of light on the early liturgies, in which at first no mention of or allusion to the dead had place, then into which later came commemorative thanksgiving for the righteous dead, then later still actual prayers for the dead, among which we find included the name of the very blessed Virgin Mary herself, as well as the *martyrs*. To show this process of *development* in those liturgies, and to show it was a development by corruption, we need only cite the fact that, as we now know and have them, these old offices could never have been known to the great and courtly Bishop of Hippo, St. Aurelius Augustine, for the latter says in his Sermon 17: "It is an *insult* to the martyrs that we should pray for them, for we ought rather to commend ourselves to their prayers."

Now it is a fact, and as we all well know, that the early liturgies do all thus "insult" the martyrs, for every one of them *pray for* the martyrs. All doctrinal development in the ancient Church, because ignoring the Scriptural and so the Divine injunction "to contend for the faith," with this strong adverbial phrase added, "*once and for all* delivered to the saints," has been a development in and to corruption. Hence as all the evidence—and in its details it is voluminous and most overwhelmingly against the practice, and from every source—goes to sustain the charge that, from some individual heretical teaching, prayers for the dead take their start, and in gradual progress of *apostatical* perversion of the truth, they pass from the harmless thankful commemoration of the faith and early examples of the righteous dead into praying for them, this last in turn to be again so changed that the righteous dead are no more prayed *for*, but prayed *to*, or invoked in behalf of the living; and the intercessory prayers of the living for the dead limited to the half wicked and half good, or, in other words, to the half-saved Christians; and finally to the altogether wicked and godless souls also, *for such souls* are distinctly, though in defiance of all Scripture, and even of the testimony of Tertullian and St. Cyprian, made objects of these prayers by the here most certainly misguided and fallible Augustine and Chrysostom—not, it is true, on the supposition that they may thereby be ultimately saved, but that they may have help to *endure their eternal torments.*

As the Roman Catholic Church has placed seventy or more passages of St. Augustine's writings in her Expurgatory Index, I think we can feel ourselves safely under the approval of God if we place this teaching of both these noted fathers in the Expurgatory Index of the primitive Catholic faith.

If possible, our closing witness gives us yet more remarkably strong evidence on the subject of this paper, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 4th century. He says: "*Many*" in the Church *opposed* the then insinuated practice of praying for the dead. He attempted to "persuade" [his own word] to its accept-

ance "by an illustration"—again his own words—or argument, which I think, by every one who has studied it, must be pronounced to be absurdly puerile, and in no possible sense a proper representation of the relation God bears to men. Cyril's presentation and defence of this practice is that these prayers are not made for the righteous departed alone, such as we exclusively find them to be in the earlier of the early liturgies, but are made equally for "sinners," for those who die in unforgiven sins. In other words, Cyril's teaching is a form of Purgatory that is repudiated in the official teaching of the Church of Rome. So little is he regarded as setting forth correctly the primitive notion of prayers for the dead, that Dr. Pusey, the late Cardinal Newman, but then Dr. Newman, and Mr. Keble, when conjoint editors of Cyril's works in the Oxford edition of the fathers, all united in rejecting this evidence of Cyril as really falsifying the teaching of the Church Catholic before him. Their note being, in part, in these words: "St. Cyril, *by himself*, as little proves the latter [*i. e.*, praying in the Eucharistic rite for departed sinners] as Tertullian that the Son of God is not from eternity." (Oxford Ed., *St. Cyril*, p. 275, note "a.") Cyril further makes this false use of his idea of prayers for the dead, by teaching most unmistakably the *invocation of saints*—a thing most solemnly warned against by St. Chrysostom and others of the fathers. But Newman, Pusey, and Keble agreed in this judgment on Cyril's teaching concerning the *Holy Eucharist* and prayers in relation to the departed: that it was Cyril's "private and *erroneous* explanations," the very words of their *note*; therefore, along with Tertullian's heresy in denying the co-eternity of God the Son with God the Father, they set this particular teaching of Cyril aside as false and uncatholic.

It is remarkable, however, that St. Cyril never presumed to give, in defence of his particular and peculiar teaching on prayers for the dead, a single passage from or reference to Holy Scripture, nor does he say one word about its having been generally adopted and observed in the Church from the earliest ages before him—proofs which he hardly could

have forborne alleging (the most convincing and silencing as they must have been), rather than confine his defence and proof to an illustration, the most absurd and actually foolish, as I think the universal sentiment must be concerning it. Had he felt that such Scriptural and primitive Catholic evidence stood ready to serve him, beyond doubt he would have seized and presented it with avidity, for, let us not forget, he was thrown upon the defence of his teaching on this question by, as he says, "the opposition of *many*"; and he did actually attempt to defend his teaching. Again: he himself had laid down the sacred rule, *ipsissimis verbis*, that nothing was to be accepted as *Christian truth* save what could be clearly established by Holy Scripture; and he even commended his own teaching to the same inspired test and touchstone (*Catech. Mystag.*, iv., p. 30, Oxford ed.). How then shall we reconcile with this rule of St. Cyril, the fact that he attempted to defend the corrupt practice of praying both for the righteous and the unrighteous dead, when the evidence carefully *studied* will most certainly convince any one that such a practice was not only not originally any part of the Church's teaching, but that the strongest positive evidence is presented from the ancient Church against praying *for* ANY of the dead? How shall we reconcile Cyril with these facts, for facts they most certainly are, unless study and evidence be a delusion. There can, I think, be but one answer, and that is that he may have derived his defence of these prayers from the Apocryphal or Deutero-Canonical books. And yet this cannot be possible, for in his catachetical instructions to his candidates for Holy Baptism he distinctly repudiates entirely the whole of the Apocryphal books, and enjoined receiving the twenty-two books of the Old Testament just as my Church receives them to-day. So we see that to reconcile Cyril on this point is an impossible thing to do. Cyril sets forth his peculiar teaching on our subject, yet without a single appeal to, or proof from, the Word of God—a confession this that in that Word he could find nothing to serve him. Had he believed that the case so often cited of St. Paul and

Onesiphorus, was one of prayers by the Apostle for the departed Onesiphorus he would have seized it hastily, and thereby silenced all opposition, but he knew, what we well know to-day, that the sentiment of the early Church was that, Onesiphorus was at the time *living*—as St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret before him, assert he was—when St. Paul uttered the prayer—"The Lord reward him in that day," and sending greeting to his household, yet not mentioning *him*; a thing this same Apostle also did in the case of the household of Stephanus, when, as we are expressly told afterwards incidentally in Scripture, Stephanus was *living*.

It is no slight evidence of the comparative newness of praying for the dead and the generally recognized fact that it was no part of the Christian religion as taught by the Holy Jesus and His Apostles that, in Jerusalem, the mother of all the Christian Church, "*many*" opposed Cyril's teaching the right of such prayers; that there "*many*" did not, and would not, pray for the dead, as Cyril admits.

As long as a man's faith is exposed to the temptations and trials of *this* life, he may well pray God to have mercy on him and turn from his soul the evils he most justly has deserved; but when his faith has by death been placed beyond the danger of falling, then surely "Jesu have mercy on him"; "Let light, refreshment, rest, and peace descend upon him," are but words of pure unbelief, and infidel to the very express precious words and promises of the Lord Jesus Himself. The Pagan *Requiescat in pace* sounds far more full of doubt about the soul for which it is said, and far less full of comfort, too, than the Christ-believing teaching of the *Requiescit* of the New Testament—the very word of God Himself, and attested by the "even so" of the Holy Spirit, as the Divine judgment and benediction on *all who* die in the Lord; and this benediction not said over them centuries, or even one year, or one month after death, when any prayers can be had for them, but pronounced by Almighty God upon them instantly as the soul wings its flight to Him who gave it.

"The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from *all* sin"—

sin of any dye, iniquity, transgression, trespass, unrighteousness, rebellion, faults of any sort, crimes, corruptions, depravity, omissions and neglects of duty, departures from the law and love of God, backslidings of the most ungrateful character—all this is included, for it says "ALL *sin*."

It is the immense power and value of this "cleansing blood" of Jesus Christ that is the living and dying Christian's assurance that "there is therefore now no condemnation" for him here and hereafter, and so no need whatever, after death, of another's prayers. Hence the consistent silence of the entire Word of God concerning any intercession for the dead; while it abounds in the sweetest expressions of Divine care and tender guardianship for the sleeping dust of the faithful, and the most clear assurances of the earned *rest* of those souls that have died in the Divine Cleanser from all sin, the adorable and precious Jesus, the Giver of immortal life.

LIST OF MEMBERS

OF THE

American Society of Church History.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Brieger, Theodor, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1870), Lic. Theol. (Halle, 1870), D.D. (*hon.* Göttingen, 1877), Professor of Church History, Leipzig, Germany.

Comba, Emilio, D.D. (*hon.* St. Andrew's, Scotland, 1885), Professor of Historical Theology in the Waldensian College, Florence, Italy.

Creighton, Rt. Rev. Mandell, LL.D. (*hon.* Glasgow, 1884; Harvard, 1886), D.C.L. (Durham, 1885), D.D. (Oxford, 1891), Bishop of Peterborough, England.

Harnack, Adolph, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1873), Lic. Theol. (Leipzig, 1874), D.D. (*hon.* Marburg, 1879), Professor of Church History, Berlin, Germany.

Mitchell, Rev. Alexander Ferrier, D.D. (St. Andrews, 1862), LL.D. (Glasgow, 1892), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, St. Andrews, Scotland.

Nippold, Friedrich, D.D. (Leiden, 1870), Professor of Church History, Jena, Germany.

Schickler, Baron Fernand de, President of the Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, Paris, France.

Wace, Rev. Henry, D.D. (Oxford, 1883; Edinburgh, 1882), Principal of Kings College, London, Eng.

Weizsäcker, Rev. Carl Heinrich von, Ph.D. (Tübingen, 1842), D.D., (*hon.* Tübingen, 1862), Professor of Church History, Tübingen, Germany.

Total . . . . . 9.

ACTIVE MEMBERS.

Abbott, Rev. Lyman, Congregationalist, D.D. (N. Y. University, N. Y. City, 1877), Editor of *The Outlook*, New York City.

*Adams, Henry, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Albree, Joseph, Allegheny, Pa.

Allen, Rev. Joseph Henry, Unitarian, D.D. (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1891), Cambridge, Mass.

Appel, Rev. Thomas Gilmore, Ph.D. (Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1866), D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., 1868), LL.D. (Lafayette College, 1885), Professor of Church History [Reformed (German)], Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.

Bagley, Burton Dillon, President of the Christian Literature Company, New York City.

Baird, Rev. Henry Martyn, Presbyterian, Ph.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1867) D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1877), LL.D. (College of New Jersey, 1882), Professor of Greek, University of the City of New York.

Baldwin, Rev. Charles Winterfield, Pastor of Wesley (Methodist) Chapel, Washington, D. C.

* Life Member.

Baldwin, Rev. Ralph Howard, New York City.

Bartlett, Rev. Edward Totterson, S.T.D. (University of Pa., Philadelphia, Pa., 1887), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Dean, of the P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Bassett, Rev. Austin Bradley, Pastor of the East Congregational Church, Ware, Mass.

Berger, Rev. Daniel, United Brethren, D.D. (Westfield College, Westfield, Ill., 1878), editor of the Sunday school literature of the United Brethren Publishing House, Dayton, Ohio.

Blatchford, Eliphalet Wickes, Chicago, Ill.

Booth, Rev. Henry Matthias, Presbyterian, D.D. (Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., 1880), President of the Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

Bowen, Rev. John Wesley Edward, Ph.D. (Boston University, Boston, Mass., 1887), D.D. (Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga., 1892), Professor of Historical Theology, Gammon Theological Seminary (Methodist), Atlanta, Ga.

Bowler, William, Cleveland, O.

Brown, Rev. Arthur Judson, D.D. (Lake Forest Univ., Lake Forest, Ill., 1891), Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Portland, Oregon.

Brown, Rev. Francis, Ph.D. (Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., 1884), D.D. (Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., 1884), Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), New York City.

Brown, Rev. William Adams, Instructor in Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), New York City.

Buckley, Rev. James Munroe, D.D. (Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn., 1876), LL.D. (Emory and Henry College, Emory, Wash. Co., Va., 1882), Editor of *The Christian Advocate* (M. E.), New York City.

Burr, George Lincoln, Professor of Ancient and Mediæval History, and Librarian of the White Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Burrage, Rev. Henry Sweetser, D.D. (Brown University, Providence, R. I., 1883), Editor of *Zion's Advocate* (Baptist), Portland, Maine.

Burrell, Rev. David James, D.D. (Parson's College, Fairfield, Ia. 1883), one of the pastors of the Collegiate Dutch Church, New York City.

Byington, Rev. Ezra Hoyt, Congregationalist, D.D. (University of Vermont, Burlington, 1890), Newton, Mass.

Carroll, Rev. Henry King, Methodist, LL.D. (Syracuse Univ., Syracuse, N. Y., 1885), religious editor of *The Independent*, New York City.

Chambers, Rev. Talbot Wilson, S.T.D. (Columbia College, N. Y. City, 1853), LL.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1885), senior minister of the Collegiate Dutch Church, New York City.

†Childs, George William, Editor of *The Public Ledger*, Philadelphia, Pa.

Coe, Rev. Edward Benton, D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1881), one of the pastors of the Collegiate Dutch Church, New York City.

Corwin, Rev. Edward Tanjore, Reformed (Dutch), D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1871), Rector of Hertzog Hall, New Brunswick, N. J.

Craig, Rev. Willis Green, D.D. (Centre College, Danville, Ky., 1873), LL.D. (Greenville and Tusculum College, Tusculum, Tenn., 1888), Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Craighead, Rev. James Geddes, Presbyterian, D.D. (Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn., 1870), Washington, D.C.

Cramer, Rev. Michael John, Lutheran, D.D. (Syracuse Univ., Syracuse, N. Y., 1873), East Orange, N. J.

Craven, Rev. Elijah Richardson, D.D. (College of N. J., Princeton, N. J., 1859), LL.D. (Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1889), Secretary of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church, Phila.

Crawford, Rev. William Henry, Methodist, D.D. (Northwestern

† Died in Philadelphia, Sat., Feb. 3, 1894.

University, Evanston, Ill., 1893), President of Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa.

Crooks, Rev. George Richard, D.D. LL.D. (both, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 1857 and 1869, respectively), Professor of Church History, Drew Theological (M. E.) Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Davidson, Thomas, New York City.

DeWitt, Rev. John, D.D. (College of N. J., Princeton, N. J., 1877), LL.D. (Hanover College, Ind., 1888), Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Princeton, N. J.

Dexter, Rev. Morton, Editor of *The Congregationalist*, Boston, Mass.

Dickinson, Rev. Cornelius Evarts, Pastor of the Congregational Church, Marietta, O.

Dodge, William Earl, New York City.

Dorchester, Rev. Daniel, Methodist, D.D. (Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., 1874), Dorchester, Mass.

Douglass, Hon. Frederick, Washington, D. C.

Drury, Rev. John Benjamin, D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1880), Editor of *The Christian Intelligencer*, Reformed (Dutch), New York City.

Dubbs, Rev. Joseph Henry, Reformed (German), D.D. (Ursinus College, Freeland, Collegeville P. O., Pa., 1878), Professor of History and Archæology, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Dulles, Rev. Joseph Heatly, Presbyterian, Librarian of Princeton Theological Seminary, N. J.

Eddy, Rev. Richard, Universalist, S.T.D. (Tufts College, College Hill, Mass., 1883), East Providence, R. I.

Elliott, Rev. George, D.D. Pastor of the Foundery M.E. Church, Washington, D.C.

Emerton, Ephraim, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1876), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Ewell, Rev. John Lewis, Congregationalist, Professor of Historical Theology and Dean of the Theological Department, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Faulkner, Rev. John Alfred, Pastor of the M. E. Church, Great Bend, Pa.

Ferree, Barr, New York City.

Fisher, Rev. George Park, Congregationalist, D.D. (Brown Univ. Providence, R. I., 1866; Edinburgh University, Scotland, 1886; Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1886), LL.D. (College of N. J., Princeton, N. J., 1879), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Foote, Rev. Lewis Ray, D.D. (Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., 1889), Pastor of the Throop Ave., Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Forrester, Rev. Henry, Albuquerque, N. M.

Fox, Rev. John, D.D. (Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1891), Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Fox, Rev. Louis Rodman, Presbyterian, Philadelphia, Pa.

Gardiner, Harry Norman, Associate Professor of Philosophy, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Gates, Rev. Caleb Frank, Congregationalist, Mardin, Turkey.

Gillett, William Kendall, Professor of Modern Languages, University of the City of New York.

Good, Rev. James Isaac, D.D. (Ursinus College, Freeland, Collegeville P. O., Pa., 1887), Reading, Pa., Professor of Church History [Reformed (German)], Theological Seminary of Ursinus College.

Gordon, Rev. John, D.D. (Western Univ. of Pa., Pittsburgh, Pa., 1889), Professor of Church History, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Omaha, Neb.

Grammer, Rev. Carl Eckhardt, Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon Law, Theological Seminary, (P. E.), Va.

Haas, Rev. John Augustus William, Pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, New York City.

* Hagerman, James John, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Hamilton, Rev. John Taylor, Professor of Church History, Moravian

* Life member.

Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.

Hamilton, Rev. William Ferguson, Presbyterian, D.D. (Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., 1880), Washington, Pa.

Hamlin, Rev. Teunis Slingerland, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1886), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of the Covenant, Washington, D. C.

Hartranft, Rev. Chester David, D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1876), President of Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn.

Hodges, Rev. George, D.D. (Western University, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1892), Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

Hoes, Rev. Roswell Randall, Presbyterian, Chaplain U. S. Navy.

Hopkins, Rev. Theodore Weld, Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Auburn, N. Y.

Hoppin, Rev. James Mason, Congregationalist, D.D. (Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., 1870), Professor of the History of Art, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

Horn, Rev. Edward Traill, D.D. (Roanoke College, Salem, Va., and Newberry College, Newberry, S. C., both 1888), Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Charleston, S. C.

Horr, Rev. George Edwin, Jr., Editor of *The Watchman*, (Baptist) Boston, Mass.

Hubbard, Hon. Gardiner Greene, LL.D. (Columbian University, Washington, D. C., 1888), Washington, D. C.

Hulbert, Rev. Eli Baker, Baptist, D.D. (Baptist Union Theological Seminary, Morgan Park, Ill., 1880), Professor of Church History, University of Chicago, Ill.

Hulbert, Rev. Henry Woodward, Presbyterian, Professor of History, Marietta College, O.

Hull, Rev. William, Principal of Hardwick Seminary (Lutheran), N. Y.

Hurst, Rev. John Fletcher, Bishop of the M. E. Church, D.D., LL.D. (both, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 1866 and 1877, respectively), Washington, D. C.

Jackson, Rev. George Anson, Pastor of the Congregational Church, Swampscott, Mass.

* Jackson, Rev. Samuel Macauley, Presbyterian, LL.D. (Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., 1892), D.D. (University of the City of New York, 1893), New York City.

Jackson, Rev. Sheldon, Presbyterian, D.D. (Hanover College, Hanover, Ind., 1874), United States General Agent of Education in Alaska.

Jacobs, Rev. Henry Eyster, D.D. LL.D. (both, Thiel College, Greenville, Pa., 1877 and 1891, respectively), Professor of Systematic Theology, Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

† Jay, Hon. John, LL.D. (Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., 1889; Columbia College, New York City, 1891), New York City.

Johnson, Rev. Thomas Cary, D.D. (Hampden Sidney College, Va., 1891), Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Hampden Sidney, Va.

Jones, Rev. Hosea Williams, D.D. (Kenyon College, Gambier, O., 1884), Dean and Professor of Church History in the Divinity School of Kenyon College (P. E.), Gambier, O.

Krotel, Rev. Gottlob Frederick, D.D. (Univ. of Pa., Phila., Pa., 1865), LL.D. (Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., 1888), Pastor of Lutheran (General Council) Holy Trinity Church, New York City.

Laidlaw, Rev. Walter, Presbyterian, New York City.

Lampe, Rev. Joseph Joachim, D.D. (Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., 1889), Ph.D. (University of the City of N.Y., 1890), Pastor of Christ Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Lasby, Rev. Charles Crowther, Methodist, Pastor in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Lasher, Rev. George William, Baptist, D.D. (Madison University, Hamilton, N.Y., 1874), Editor of the *Journal and Messenger*, Cincinnati, O.

* Lea, Henry Charles, LL.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1868; Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1890), Philadelphia,

* Life Member.

† Died in New York, Sat., May 5, 1894.

* Learned, Rev. Dwight Whitney, Congregationalist, Ph.D. (Yale, 1873), Kioto, Japan.

Leavens, Rev. Philo French, D.D. (University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., 1888), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Passaic, N. J.

Lewis, Rev. Abram Herbert, D.D. (Alfred University, Alfred Centre, Neb., 1881), Pastor of the Seventh-Day Baptist Church, Plainfield, N. J.

Lowrey, Rev. Asbury, Methodist, D.D. (Asbury University, Greencastle, Ind., 1864), New York City.

Ludlow, Rev. James Meeker, D.D. (Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., 1872), Litt.D. (College of N. J., Princeton, N. J., 1888), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, East Orange, N. J.

McConnell, Rev. Samuel D, D.D. (University of Pa., Phila. Pa., 1887), Rector of St. Stephen's P. E. Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

* McCook, John James, LL.D. (Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 1890, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 1893), New York City.

MacCracken, Rev. Henry Mitchell, Presbyterian, D.D. (Wittenberg College, Springfield, O., 1877), LL.D. (Miami Univ., Oxford, O., 1887), Chancellor of the University of the City of New York.

McGiffert, Rev. Arthur Cushman, Ph.D. (Marburg, Germany, 1888), D.D. (Adelbert College, Western Reserve University, 1892), Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

McIlvain, Rev. James William, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Annapolis, Md.

Mackay-Smith, Alexander, D.D. (Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 1889), S. T. D. (Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., 1889), Rector of St. John's P. E. Church, Washington, D.C.

McKim, Rev. Randolph Harrison, D.D. (Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., 1871), Rector of the P. E. Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D.C.

McLanahan, George William, Washington, D. C.

Matthews, Rev. Shailer, Professor of History, Colby University, Waterville, Me.

Miller, Rev. William Sydney, Pastor of the Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

Mitchell, Edwin Knox, Professor of Græco-Roman and Eastern Church History, Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn.

Moore, Rev. Edward Caldwell, Pastor of the Central Congregational Church, Providence, R. I.

Newman, Rev. Albert Henry, D.D. (Mercer Univ., Macon, Ga., 1885), LL.D. (Southwestern Baptist University, Jackson, Tenn., 1883), Professor of Church History and Comparative Religion, McMaster University, Toronto, Canada.

Nicum, Rev. John, Pastor of St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Rochester, N. Y.

Norcross, Rev. George, D.D. (College of N. J., Princeton, N. J., 1879), Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Carlisle, Pa.

O'Gorman, Rev. Thomas, D.D. (by Pope Leo XIII., 1891), Professor of Modern Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Paine, Rev. Levi Leonard, D.D. (Yale College, New Haven, Conn., 1875), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, (Congregational) Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.

Pellew, Henry Edward, Washington, D. C.

Perry, Rt. Rev. William Stevens, D.D. (Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 1869; Oxford University, Eng., 1888), LL.D. (William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., 1876), D.C.L. (University of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Can., 1885; King's College University, Windsor, N. S., 1887), Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Iowa, Davenport, Ia.

Potter, Rt. Rev. Henry Codman, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1865; Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., 1869; Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1890; Oxford University, 1892), LL.D. (Union, 1881; Cambridge

* Life Member.

University, Eng., 1888), Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York, New York City.

Power, Rev. Frederick Dunglison, Pastor of the Vermont Avenue Christian Church (Disciples), Washington, D. C.

Prentiss, Rev. George Lewis, D.D. (Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., 1854), Professor of Pastoral Theology, Church Polity, and Mission Work, (Presbyterian) Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Prime, Rev. Wendell, Presbyterian, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1880), Editor of *The New York Observer*, New York City.

Prugh, Rev. John Hassler, Pastor of Grace Reformed (German) Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Purves, Rev. George Tybout, D.D. (Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., 1888), Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Princeton, N. J.

Rankin, Rev. Isaac Ogden, Presbyterian, Peekskill, N. Y.

Rankin, Rev. Jeremiah Eames, D.D., LL.D. (both Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., 1869 and 1889, respectively), Congregationalist, President of Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Rhoads, James E, M.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1851), LL.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1890), President of Bryn Mawr College, Pa.

Richard, Rev. James William, D.D. (Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., 1866), Professor of Homiletics, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Richardson, Rev. Ernest Cushing, Ph.D. (Western University of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1883), Librarian of the College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.

Riggs, Rev. James Forsyth, D.D. (Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J., 1892), Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Theological Seminary (Reformed Dutch), New Brunswick, N. J.

Roberts, Rev. William Henry, Presbyterian, D.D. (Western University of Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1883), LL.D. (Miami University, Oxford, O., 1888), Philadelphia, Pa.

Rogers, Rev. Edwin Everett, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Zanesville, O.

Rogers, Rev. James William, Pastor of the Disciple Church, Walton, Kentucky.

Ropes, Rev. William Ladd, Librarian of the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

† Ross, Rev. Abel Hastings, D.D. (Olivet College, Olivet, Mich., 1884), Pastor of Congregational Church, Port Huron, Mich.

Rossiter, Rev. Stealy Bales, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1886), Pastor of the North Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Ruston, Rev. William Otis, D.D. (Lenox College, Hopkinton, Ia., 1886), Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Dubuque, Iowa.

Schaff, Rev. David Schley, D.D. (Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill., 1891), Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Jacksonville, Ill.

† Schaff, Rev. Philip, Lic. Theol. (Berlin, 1841), D.D. (University of Berlin, 1854, University of St. Andrews, Scotland, 1887; University of the City of New York, 1893), LL.D. (Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., 1876), Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Scott, Rev. George Robert White, Congregationalist, D.D. (Middlebury College, Vt., Olivet College, Mich., both, 1884), Leominster, Mass.

Scott, Rev. Hugh McDonald, D.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Phila., Pa., 1886), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Congregational Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Seip, Rev. Theodore Lorenzo, Lutheran, D.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Phila., Pa., 1886), President of Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.

Seiss, Rev. Josephus Augustus, D.D. (Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., 1860), LL.D. (Roanoke College, Salem, Va., 1874), Pastor of

† Died at Port Huron, Mich., May 13, 1893.

Died in New York City, October 20, 1893.

the Holy Communion (Lutheran) Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Shahan, Rev. Thomas Joseph, D.D. (College of the Propaganda, Rome, 1882), Professor of Ancient Church History, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Sheldon, Rev. Henry Clay, D.D. (Lawrence University, Wis., 1887), Professor of Historical Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

†Shepard, Col. Elliott Fitch, M.L. (University of the City of New York, 1892), LL.D. (University of Omaha, Neb., 1892), New York City.

Sheraton, Rev. James Paterson, D.D. (Queen's University, Ontario, Canada, 1882), Principal of Wycliffe College (Church of England), Toronto, Canada.

Shields, Robert, Neenah, Wisconsin.

Show, Rev. Arley Barthlow, Associate Professor of European History, in Leland Stanford Jr. University, Palo Alto, Cal.

Small, Rev. Charles Herbert, Pastor of Mt. Pleasant Congregational Church and Professor of Pastoral Theology and Church Institutions in Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Smith, Rev. Jonathan Ritchie, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Peekskill, N. Y.

Smith, Rev. Judson, D.D. (Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., 1877), Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., Boston, Mass.

Smith, Thomas Edward Vermilye, New York City.

Smyth, Rev. Egbert Coffin, D.D. (Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., 1866), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Theological Seminary (Congregational), Andover, Mass.

Spaeth, Rev. Adolph, D.D. (University of Pennsylvania, Phila., Pa., 1875), New York Professor in Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

Stakely, Rev. Charles Averette, D.D. (Richmond College, Richmond, Va., 1889), Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C.

Steele, Rev. James Dallas, Ph.D. (University of Omaha, Neb., 1892), Pastor of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Storrs, Rev. Richard Salter, D.D. (Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1853), LL.D. (Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., 1859), Pastor of the Church of the Puritans, Congregational, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Strong, Rev. Josiah, Congregationalist, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1874), General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States of America, New York City.

Stuart, Rev. Charles Macaulay, B.D. (Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., 1883), Associate Editor of *The Northwestern Christian Advocate* (M.E.), Chicago.

Tadlock, Rev. James Doak, D.D. (Hampden Sidney College, Va., 1876), LL.D. (King College, Tenn., 1891), Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), Columbia, S. C.

Terry, Rev. Roderick, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1882), Pastor of the South Reformed (Dutch) Church, New York City.

Thatcher, Rev. Oliver Joseph, Assistant Professor of History, University of Chicago, Ill.

Thomas, Allen Clapp, Professor of History, Haverford College, Pa.

Thomas, Richard Henry, M.D. (University of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., 1875), Baltimore, Maryland.

Tiffany, Rev. Charles Comfort, Episcopalian, D.D. (Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 1884), New York City

Titzel, Rev. John Martin, D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., 1852), Pastor of the First Reformed (German) Church, Lancaster, Pa.

True, Rev. Benjamin Osgood, D.D. (Rochester University, Rochester, N. Y., 1888), Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Theological Seminary (Baptist), Rochester, N. Y.

Van Dyke, Rev. Paul, Pastor of the Edwards Church (Congregational), Northampton, Mass.

† Died in New York City, March 24, 1893.

Vedder, Henry Clay (Baptist), Associate Editor of *The Examiner*, New York.

Votaw, Rev. Clyde Weber, Baptist, Docent in Biblical Literature and University Extension Reader in New Testament Literature, University of Chicago, Ill.

Walker, Williston, Ph.D. (Leipzig, 1888), Waldo Professor of Germanic and Western Church History, Theological Seminary (Congregational), Hartford, Conn.

Warfield, Rev. Benjamin Breckinridge, D.D., LL.D. (both, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J., 1880 and 1892, respectively), Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology (Presbyterian), Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

Wells, Rev. Charles Luke (in England).

Wells, Rev. Newell Woolsey, Pastor South Third Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Williams, Ven. Gilbert Fearing, Archdeacon of Washington, D. C.

Wilson, Hon. Thomas, Washington, D. C.

Wolf, Rev. Edmund Jacob, D.D. (Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., 1876), Professor of Church History, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Zenos, Rev. Andreas Constantinides, D.D. (College of New Jersey, Princeton, 1888), Professor of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History, McCormick Theological Seminary, (Presbyterian), Chicago, Ill.

Whole number living 172

INDEX.

A

Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, 89.
American Revision Committee, 4.
Apostolic succession in the Church of England, the doctrine of, 169; definitions, 171; *First Period*, 172; extracts from the "Resolutions of several bishops and divines," 173; "A Declaration made of the Functions and Divine Institutions of Bishops and Priests," 174; John Jewell, Richard Field, 175; the Puritans and *jure divino* Church government, 176; Hooker, Keble, Grindal, Fleetwood, 177; Hall, Bacon, 178; Laud, "Liturgy and Episcopacy," 179; Hall, "Episcopacy by Divine Right," 180; "Humble Remonstrance for Liturgy and Episcopacy," 181; Smectymnuus, 182; Stillingfleet, 183; *Second Period*, Isaac Barrow, 185; John Wesley, 186; George Tourline, 187; William Paley, Whately, 188; Stanley, Alford, Jacob, Hatch, Lightfoot, 189; the "Declaration of Principles and Objects," 190; belief in the doctrine voluntary, 191.
Aristotle and his influence, 96.
Asbury, Bishop Francis, 35; place in American history, 37; birth and parentage, 38; character, 39; appointed to the American mission, 40; "I have great cause to believe I am not running before I am sent for," 43; landing in Philadelphia, 44; visit to New York and New Rochelle, 46; as a Christian and evangelist, 46; his devotion and passion for purity, 47; itinerancy, "I will show them how to do it," results, 48; enforcement of discipline, 50; bishop, "It may be of God," 52; father to our educational system, 54; Cokesbury College, 57; missionary activity, the "mite," 58; Sunday-schools, 59; last days and death, 59.
Augustine, St., on prayers for the martyrs, 207.

B

Backus, chairman of Committee on Grievances, 155; in the provincial congress of Philadelphia, 156, 157; address to the people of New England, 158; appeal to the people of Massachusetts, 163; opposition to the Federal Constitution, 164.
Baldwin, D.D., Rev. Thomas, 165, 166.
Baptists, in Massachusetts, 150; Henry Fish's testimony to their position, 152; the memorial in their behalf to the provincial congress in Philadelphia, 156; discussion of the third article of the Bill of Rights, 159–162; revision of the constitution of Massachusetts, 166; their services in the contest for religious liberty, 167.

C

Charles XII. of Sweden and the Protestants of Silesia, 72.
Christianity, in contact with the Greek philosophy, 93; a double current, the birth of Christian theology, 94; the patristic school, 95; scholasticism, 96.
Clementine Recognitions, Faust and the, 131; their popularity, 140, 142.
Confessions of Augustine, the, and the Faust legend, 137, 139.
Cyprian and Tertullian, 207.

D

Dead, prayers for the, *see* Prayers for the Dead.

E

Education in the middle ages, 89.
Egypt, prayers for the dead, 195.
Episcopal Church, the, 20, 169.

F

Faust and the Clementine Recognitions, 131; Faust Junior and the Faust-book, 134; Faust in art, 135; the Faust idea an evolution, 135; Faust Junior and Faust Senior, 136; Faustus not a family name or the printer Fust or from *faustus* "lucky" or Faustus Socinus, 136; the hypothesis of Schwetschke and that of Grimm refer only to the Faust-book, not to Faust Junior, 137; Faustus the Manichean, Faustus of Byzantium, Faustulus and Helena, 137; Faustus Junior, Magus Secundus, Simon Magus, the Recognitions, 138; Faustus Junior acquainted with the Clementine literature, 139; Steitz's argument, 139; the boasts of Faustus are echoes of those of Simon, 141; the testimony of Mutianus, 141; documents, 143.
Ferdinand II. breaks his promise to the Protestants of Silesia, 69.

G

Gerhardt, Paul, and Schmolck as hymn-writers, 77.
German Reformed Church, the, 9.
"Germany: its Universities, Theology, and Religions," 13.
Gospel, of Peter, the, 98; discovery and description of the fragment, 101; compared with the canonical and apocryphal gospels, it is orthodox, 102; its alleged Docetism cannot be established (see Appendix, 125–130), and cannot be urged as an argument against its use by fathers of the second century, 103; the first explicit mention of it by Serapion vouches for its general orthodoxy, 104; Origen only refers once to it, but probably used it, 105; Eusebius mentions it twice and classes it among those works which were cited by the heretics under the name of the Apostles, but he had never seen it, 105; Jerome and *Decretum Galasis* simply follow Eusebius, and Theodoret's report is far from trustworthy, 106; the question then arises: Was it used by any fathers earlier thon Serapion, and, if so, what character did it bear? 107; there can be little doubt, that it was known to Justin Martyr and used by him, 107–112; there are also some points of resemblance between it and the epistle of Barnabas, 112; and it is possible that many of the agrapha in the works of the earlier fathers belong to it, 113; relation to the canonical gospels, 115; to Matthew, 115; to Luke and John, 117; bibliography, 119: Appendix (reprint from the New York *Independent*), 125.

K

Krause, Pastor, indicted by the Jesuit College for saying that invocation of the Virgin was not needful to salvation, 70.

L

Liturgies, the earliest, on prayer for the dead, 208.

M

Maccabees, 2d, on prayers for the dead, 196.
Martyrs, prayers for the, 206–208.
Massachusetts, the contest for religious liberty in, 147; providing for the support of the Christian ministry 1638, 1646, 1654, 1658, 149; application of the laws by special order 1659, 150; Baptists in Massachusetts, 150; exemption from parish tax, 151; Henry Fish's testimony to their position, 152; the law of 1753, 153; the Warren Association, 154; Mr. Backus chairman of the Committee on Grievances, 155; his letter to Samuel Adams, 155; the memorial in behalf of the Baptists of Massachusetts before the meeting in Philadelphia 1774, 156; the answer of the provincial congress, 157; Mr.

Backus's memorial to the General Court in 1775, 158 ; the formation of the State constitution, 158 ; discussion of the third article of the Bill of Rights, 159–162 ; reappearance of the old difficulties, 163 ; the Constitution of the United States, 164 ; the petition by Thomas Baldwin, 165 ; revision of the constitution of Massachusetts, 166 ; the amendment of Dr. Williams, 166 ; the services of the Baptists of Massachusetts in securing complete separation of Church and State, 167.
Methodist Episcopal Church, the, 7, 39, 45 ; its ministry, "the school-made preacher," 57 ; "the mite," 58 ; Sunday-schools, 59 ; General Conference of 1812, 60 ; position in Massachusetts, 165.
Monte Cassino, the abbey of, 83.

P

Peter, the Gospel of, *see* Gospel.
Prayers for the Dead, 193 ; in Egypt, India, Turkey, Greece, 195 ; the one passage in the Old Testament, 2d Maccabees, 196 ; silence of the New Testament, 197 ; its significance, 198 ; silence of the earliest fathers, 199 ; the Apologies of Justin Martyr, 200 ; first mention by Tertullian, 202 ; where did he get it from, 203 ; analysis of Tertullian's idea, 204 ; self-contradictions and obscure style, 206 ; St. Cyprian, 207 ; early liturgies, 208 ; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 208 ; the Oxford edition of his works, 209 ; the comparative newness of the doctrine, 211.

Q

Quakers, the, in Pennsylvania, 9 ; in Massachusetts, 151, 152.

R

Religious liberty in Massachusetts, the contest for, 147. *See* Massachusetts.
Restitution Edict, the, of 1629, repealing the reformation in Bohemia and Silesia, 69.

S

Schaff, Philip, memorial meeting, 1 ; as a Bible student and reviser, 3 ; uniting Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon scholarship, 7 ; relation to the Lutheran Church, 13 ; relation to the Episcopal Church, 20 ; relation to the Roman Catholic Church, 26 ; as a literary worker, 29 ; tribute from a Unitarian, 32 ; founder of the American Society of Church History, xv. ; obituary, xix.
Schmolck, Benjamin, author of "My Jesus, as Thou Wilt," 63 ; spelling of his name, birth, parentage, 65 ; Steinau, Liegnitz, Breslau, Lauban, 66 ; university of Leipzig, 67 ; his talent as a hymn-writer, associate to his father, elected pastor of the Protestant Church in Schweidnitz, 68 ; persecution of Protestantism in Silesia, 69 ; first collection of hymns, 1704, 71 ; pastor-primarius, 72 ; concessions to the Protestants through the agency of Charles XII., 72 ; second and third volume of hymns, 73 ; conflagration in Schweidnitz, three new collections of hymns, 1720, 74 ; his fame, 74 ; a stroke of paralysis, death, 76 ; estimate of his hymns, 77 ; analysis of "My Jesus, as Thou Wilt," 77.
Scholasticism, the development of, 93–96.
Stanley, Dean, 24, 189.

T

Tertullian, on prayers for the dead, 202–206.
Thomas Aquinas, the life and work of, 79 ; sources and literature, 81 ; birth, parentage, entrance into the school of Monte Cassino, 83 ; life and education there, 84 ; returns home, studies in Naples, 85 ; scholasticism and monasticism, Thomas wants to enter the Dominican order, 87 ; his family objects, 87 ; detention in Rocca Secca, escape, 88 ; studies in Cologne under Albertus Magnus, 89 ; "the great dumb Sicilian ox," 90 ; visits Paris, becomes *Magister Studiorum* in Co-

logne, revisits Paris, takes his degree, and writes his *Summa contra Gentiles*, 91; is called to Rome, 91; writes his *Summa Theologica*, 92; returns to Paris, settles finally in Naples, 92; death, 93; the place of S. Thomas in the Church, 93; the development of scholasticism, 96; the influence of S. Thomas, editions of his works, 96.

U

Union of Christendom, 15, 21, 27.
Universalists in Massachusetts, 165.

W

Wiedmann, Pastor, imprisoned for a book twelve years after its publication, 70.

DATE DUE

BR 140.5 .A53 1894 v.6

Papers of the American
Society of Church History.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
3 0645 1001 2044 9